Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-004
Friday
5 January 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-004 *5 January 1990*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S., NATO Reductions in Europe Reviewed *[Chernyshev on TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports on Gerasimov's 4 Jan Briefing 2
Trial of Noriega 2
U.S. Remarks on Lithuania 2
Shevardnadze Visit to Romania 2
No Soviet Interference in Romania 2
Statement on GDR 'Neofascist Elements' 3
Attempt To Oust Najibullah Denied 3
Kasparov Remarks on Mongolia 3
Shevardnadze Reviews General Assembly Session *[TASS]* 4
Kashlev on European Changes, Common Home Idea *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jan]* 4
French View of European Integration Welcomed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jan]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Extends Sanctions Against Libya Again *[TASS]* 6
KGB to 'Expand Contacts' With CIA, Others *[TASS]* 6
Administration Allegedly Fears Noriega Testimony *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jan]* 6
Bush Seen 'Ill at Ease' Over Noriega, Panama *[PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 7
TASS Cites U.S. 'Crimes' in Latin America 8
Bush Interviewed on Soviet, E. Europe Changes *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Jan]* 8

China

Soviet-PRC Cooperation Since Gorbachev Visit *[Moscow International]* 8

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Interviews Japanese Foreign Minister *[31 Dec]* 9
Soviet Ambassador to Japan Solovyev Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 10

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Technology Minister Arrives for Talks *[TASS]* 10
Najibullah Lauds USSR's Self-Sacrifices *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 11
'Ice Age' in Relations With Egypt Ends *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Jan]* 13
Commentary Views Mubarak's Visit to Sudan *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 14
Vorontsov Meets UAE Trade, Economy Minister *[Manama WAKH]* 14
Ministers Send Condolences on Pakistan Rail Crash *[Moscow Radio]* 15

East Europe

Shevardnadze Writes Letter on Romanian Events *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 15
Romania's Brucan Cited on Shevardnadze Visit *[PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 16
Romanian Life Said Returning to Normal *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Jan]* 17
Necessary Romanian Agrarian Reforms Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jan]* 18
Albanian Leader Cited on Reform, Economy *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jan]* 19
Bulgarian Roundtable Discussion Moving Ahead *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jan]* 19
CSSR President Havel Visits Berlin, Holds Talks *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jan]* 19

Havel Says CSSR To Fulfill Pact Commitments *[TASS]* 20
Adamec Cited on CPCZ Future Activity *[PRAVDA 4 Jan]* 20
Czechoslovak Leaders, Changes Pondered *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Dec]* 20
GDR Neofascism Not Simply Result of Change *[Patsyuk on Moscow Radio]* 24
GDR Opposition Election Alliance Formed *[PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 25
Hungary's Vastag Addresses Journalists *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 25
Hungarian Ambassador Arrives in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jan]* 25
Poland To Receive Western Credits From IMF *[PRAVDA 3 Jan]* 25
Scientist Analyzes East European Developments *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Jan]* 26

West Europe

France's Dumas Cited on USSR-EEC Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 29
Armenian SSR Warned Not To Demand Turkish Land *[Istanbul MILLIYET 27 Dec]* 30
PRAVDA Views FRG Attitudes on German Unity *[3 Jan]* 30

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Bases Predicted To Remain in Panama After 2000 *[Isayev on Moscow Radio]* 32
U.S. Planning Troop Withdrawal From Panama *[TASS]* 33
Cuban TV Interview With Fidel Castro Reported *[PRAVDA 3 Jan]* 33
PCCh Document on Role of Pinochet, Armed Forces *[Moscow International]* 34
CPSU Sends Condolences on Arismendi Death *[PRAVDA 29 Dec]* 34

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

Magazine Publishes Ryzhkov Congress Report *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Sakharov's Undelivered Speech on Legal Code *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 52]* 35
Reporters Evaluate Congress TV Coverage *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 16 Dec]* 36

Political & Social

Gorbachev To Visit Lithuania 10-12 Jan *[Moscow International]* 39
Lithuanian Leaders Comment on Visit to Moscow *[Vilnius Radio]* 39
Lithuanian Officials Comment on Gorbachev Talks *[Vilnius Radio]* 40
Lithuanians Interviewed on Party Split *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Dec]* 42
Alternative Lithuanian Party Holds Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Dec]* 43
Corruption Among Lithuanian Officials Detailed *[TRUD 15 Dec]* 43
Lithuanian Provisional Party Briefs Newsmen *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Jan]* 45
Vadim Medvedev's Visit to Vilnius Examined *[GIMTASIS KRASTAS No 49]* 45
Kaunas City Executive Committee Resigns *[Vilnius International]* 46
Sajudis Activist Cited on Relations With Communists *[Vilnius International]* 46
Latvian Party Plenum Postponed Until Late January *[Vilnius International]* 47
Latvian Solidarity Movement With Lithuania Meets *[Riga Radio]* 47
Latvian Supreme Soviet To View Ethnic Rights Bill *[TASS]* 47
Estonian Party Plenum Resumes Deliberations *[Moscow TV]* 48
Supports Lithuanian Independence *[Vilnius International]* 48
Decides on Candidates, Meetings *[Tallinn Radio]* 48
Vyalyas Address *[Tallinn Radio]* 49
TASS Report 50
Plenum Ends *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Titma Views Plenum's Work *[Tallinn Radio]* 50
Unpopular Economic Measures Adopted in Estonia *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 51
Titma Discusses Estonian Komsomol Affairs *[MOLODIZH ESTONII 28 Nov]* 51
Youth Daily Rounds up Estonian Political News *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Dec]* 52
Archbishop Kirill on West Ukraine Developments *[Moscow TV]* 53
Language Study Conference Held in Ukraine *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 19 Nov]* 53
Ukrainian Official Cited on Greek Catholics *[IZVESTIYA 28 Dec]* 54
Belorussia To Pay Chernobyl Allowance *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jan]* 54
Press Conference on Chernobyl Held in Belorussia *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 18 Nov]* 55
New Gomel Obkom First Secretary Elected *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 23 Nov]* 59

Georgian SSR Decree on Military Service *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 30 Nov]* 59
150,000 Azeris Demonstrate in Baku 4 Jan *[AFP]* 59
Baku Reports Arrival of Girenko, Nishanov *[Baku Radio]* 60
Visit Border Region *[TASS]* 61
Illegal Border Crossings Into Iran Viewed *[Baku Radio]* 61
Ethnic Unrest in NKAO *[Baku Radio]* 61
Yerevan Compares NKAO, Nakhichevan Incidents *[Yerevan Radio]* 62
Details 2 Jan Incident in NKAO *[ARMENPRES]* 62
Deputies Appeal to Gorbachev *[Yerevan Radio]* 63
Armenians in Azerbaijan Want To Join Armenia *[Yerevan International]* 63
New Chairman Elected to Armenian Civil Aviation *[ARMENPRES]* 64
Nagorno-Karabakh Commission Chairman Approved *[TASS]* 64
Kurdish Writer Condemns Azerbaijan's Treatment *[Yerevan Radio]* 64
Uzbek Official Comments on Election Experience *[KOMSOMOLETS UZBEKISTANA 28 Nov]* .. 65
New Ministry, State Committee in Kazakh SSR *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 66
Investigation of 1986 Alma-Ata Riots Viewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 51]* 66
Yakovlev Interviewed on Past Political Trials *[TASS]* 69
KGB Chief on Need for Social Stability, Unity *[TASS]* 70
Bulgarian Paper's Interview *[Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT 22 Dec]* 70
Activities of Special Militia Unit Cited *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 71
USSR Procuracy Holds Meeting on Racketeering *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 72
New RSFSR Internal Affairs Head Interviewed *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 72
Registration of RSFSR Deputies Candidates Begins *[TASS]* 75
Komsomol Central Committee Bureau Meets *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Dec]* 75
Border Guards Study Buryat Language *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]* 75
Deputies' Club Appeal Supports Perestroyka *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 52]* 76
Urals Deputies Unite To Push Issues *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Dec]* 77
Pamyat Organizer Medvedev On Trial *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 1 Dec]* 77
Supreme Soviet Privileges Commission Function Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 10 Dec]* 77
New Deputy Premier Laverov Describes First Steps *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 80
Lyubimov Discusses Return to Taganka Theater *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 21 Dec]* 80
Gidaspov Comments on Leningrad Events *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Dec]* 82
Moscow Party Leader Visits Production Association *[Moscow Radio]* 83
Moscow Communists Hold Public Meeting *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 13 Dec]* 83
Foundation Formed To Cultivate Talented Youth *[TASS]* 84
Inertia in, Exodus From Party Criticized *[PRAVDA 31 Dec]* 84
New Obkom First Secretary in Arkhangelsk *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 51]* 86
Gorbachev Plenum Speech Published as Brochure *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Readers' Letters on Socialism Reviewed *[PRAVDA 3 Jan]* 87
Siberian Writers Association Formed *[LITURNAYA GAZETA No 48]* 91
Interior Ministry Publication in Petrozavodsk *[Moscow Radio]* 91
Writer Criticizes MOLODAYA GVARDIYA *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jan]* 91
New Publication SOYUZ Available 5 Jan *[Moscow Radio]* 92
New Newspaper Issued in Latvia *[Riga Radio]* 92
Gosteleradio Head on Broadcast Plans *[GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA 1 Jan]* 93
RSFSR Video Channel to Start 7 Jan *[Moscow TV]* 94

Economic

Association Chairman Comments on Grain Imports *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 9 Dec]* 94
Effectiveness of Currency Reform Debated *[TRUD 16 Dec]* 96
Quality of Economic Laws Concerns Minister *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 50]* 97
Moves To Protect Foreign Investment Discussed *[Stepanov on TASS]* 98

Scientific

Glavkosmos Chief Defends Space Budget, Goals *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 51]* 99

Military

Official Outlines Military Exchange Programs *[TASS]* 104

U.S., NATO Reductions in Europe Reviewed

LD0401193990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1158 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The polemics over the issue of the possible scale of the reduction of the U.S. military presence in Europe, which have developed recently in the United States, deserve serious attention. It is well known that President George Bush put forward an initiative envisaging a negotiated reduction in the numbers of the U.S. and Soviet armed forces located in Western and Eastern Europe to a level of 275,000 men. However, it would seem that this initiative also has lagged behind events, since it was put forward prior to the occurrence on the continent of a substantial change in the political situation which plainly requires a review of all military strategies.

It is therefore quite understandable why a number of legislators—including Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Congress, and Carl Levin, a member of the committee—are raising the issue of more significant reductions in the U.S. military contingent in Europe. It is being proposed that even as a result of the first stage of the Vienna negotiations this contingent could be reduced by a third—that is to 200,000 men. Such a step could cut additional funds from the military budget, the vast size of which is being sharply criticized by most legislators in the U.S. Congress. After all, 60 percent of the U.S. budget of $300 billion goes on preparations for a possible war in Europe.

I would like to note the fact that the idea of deeper reductions in the personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States and the USSR fully accords with the position of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact member countries. Let me remind you that in the first half of 1989, the USSR put forward a proposal whereby it might be possible at the Vienna talks to achieve agreement on the establishment in Europe of equal levels for land forces and frontline (tactical) aviation personnel at 1.35 million men on each side. If this proposal were adopted, the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO each would be reduced in the continent by more than 1 million servicemen.

This proposal reflects the fundamental essence of the philosophy of our approach to the issues of ensuring stability and security while maintaining the levels of armed forces at a minimum. Its implementation, along with proposals on reducing the main kinds of offensive weapons of the two sides, would make it possible to carry out a transition to such a structure and composition of the armed forces to correspond to the principles of defensive sufficiency and ensure confidence that both sides are guided by military doctrines that have no offensive orientation.

Discussing the issue of reducing Soviet and U.S. troops in Eastern and Western Europe, one cannot fail to notice the "double- standard" that is still maintained in the North Atlantic alliance's position regarding the numerical strength of the personnel of the Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces on the continent. At the Vienna talks, the West continues to insist that only the USSR and U.S. troops stationed outside their national territories should be reduced. Socialist countries are not against that, but they have proposed, at the same time, to reduce the British, French, Belgian, Netherlands, and Canadian troops stations in the FRG, which number 160,000 people. So far, however, this proposal has not received a positive answer.

Finally, the last thing: During the third special session of the UN General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Soviet Union put forward a proposal according to which member states of this organization should provide the UN secretary general with data on their military presence abroad and on foreign military presence within their territories. The USSR is confident that making such data available would promote within the UN Organization the reaffirmation of high standards of openness in the military sphere, confidence-building, and also the expansion of objective information on the military potentials available to the world community. Our country also hopes that such a step would promote a constructive discussion of the issues of a gradual reduction of foreign military presence with the purpose of its full elimination.

TASS Reports on Gerasimov's 4 Jan Briefing

Trial of Noriega

LD0401161290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1531 GMT 4 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—"No court sentence will in any way justify the U.S. intervention in Panama." This is the appraisal of the Soviet side regarding the upcoming court examination of General Noriega, who surrendered to U.S. authorities in Panama on Wednesday. This appraisal was made public here today at the briefing by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The arrest of Gen Noriega, the Soviet diplomat recalls, was one of the reasons the United States gave to justify its intervention. For its part the USSR subjected these arguments to criticism, having stated that, irrespective of the motives, the actions of the United States are a violation of the UN Charter.

"This is not the course of behavior that should have been chosen if the United States believed that Noriega is involved in drug dealing," Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed. "In any case, in lording it in someone else's territory, in someone else's country, the United States is violating all the norms of international law," he said.

U.S. Remarks on Lithuania

LD0401151690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—The recent statements by U.S. State Department spokesmen regarding Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Lithuania give rise "at least to surprise," stated Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, at a briefing today.

"Conjectures of any kind in this connection are unacceptable, inappropriate, and tactless," he stressed. "The State Department should realize that nobody may interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union."

"It is very strange," Gennadiy Gerasimov continued, that the planned trip by Mikhail Gorbachev to Lithuania has attracted the attention of the chairman and cochairman of the U.S. Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, who delivered a special statement on behalf of this commission. [Quote marks as received]

"As for the trip itself," he added, "we will try to report it in good time."

In reply to a question about whether there was a meeting today betweeen Mikhail Gorbachev and Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said: "We speak for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, it is quite possible that such talks are going on, since the leaders of Lithuania are in Moscow."

Shevardnadze Visit to Romania

LD0401133990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow 4 Jan (TASS)—The official visit to Romania of USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the invitation of Sergiu Celac, foreign minister of that country, will begin on 6 January. Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, reported this at a briefing today, noting that at present, Romania is living through a crucial moment in its history. The Foreign Ministry representative recalled that the Soviet side has recognized the National Salvation Front's council in Romania and has stated its political and moral support for the Romanian people.

Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed that people in the Soviet Union look with optimism at prospects for relations with Romania. He expressed the view that the forthcoming visit by the head of the Soviet foreign policy department will promote their development to a significant extent.

No Soviet Interference in Romania

LD0401172590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 4 Jan 90

["Briefing at USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: Round-up"—TASS headline]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—[Passage omitted] The Foreign Ministry spokesman commented on a report by Britain's ITN television company that Silviu Brucan, one of the present leaders of Romania, allegedly said that the Soviet Union had promised to support the revolution in Romania several months before it started. "Our investigations at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs have led to the conclusion that there were no such promises at an official level," Gennadiy Gerasimov stated. As the leaders of Romania have been emphasizing, he went on to say, the uprising was spontaneous and provoked by events in Timisoara. [passage omitted]

Answering a question about a trip to the USSR by 'Ezer Weizman, Israel's minister of science and development, which starts today, Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed that it is unofficial. The minister's visit is taking place through the USSR Academy of Sciences. He will have meetings and conversations with the academy's leadership and will visit a number of scientific institutions. No official meetings are scheduled, the Soviet diplomat stressed. From 6-10 January, he announced, 'Ezer Weizman will be in Leningrad.

Statement on GDR 'Neofascist Elements'

LD0401155690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1504 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement today in connection with reports about escapades involving right-wing extremist and neofascist elements in various towns in the GDR. The statement was read at a briefing here by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The document notes the obvious nature of close contacts between neo-fascists in the GDR with the "Republican" party in the FRG. The leaders of that party, the statement says, including former members of the SS, are openly boasting about the fact that tens of groups of their supporters are active in the GDR. Making use of the opening up of the border between the GDR and the FRG, the West German "Republicans" are sending to the GDR fascist literature, technical means, and are even promising to organize support for their confederates at elections to the People's Chamber of the GDR.

The Soviet Union, stressed Gennadiy Gerasimov, has repeatedly drawn attention to the vitality of fascist ideology and to the danger of neo-Nazi forces entering the political arena. Unfortunately they have tried every time in Bonn to minimize such danger and to present the actions of neo-Nazi forces as the escapades of individual incorrigible extremists not playing at politics. However, neo-Nazism is now acquiring new nourishing soil in connection with the campaign that has been unleashed in the FRG for the restoration of the German Reich and a review of postwar European borders.

The emergence of a neo-Nazi virus in the GDR gives rise to a feeling of profound alarm, anger, and indignation among all honest people in the Republic, the Foreign Ministry statement goes on to say. The large-scale demonstration on 3 January at the memorial to the Soviet liberation troops in Berlin's Treptower Park was a powerful expression of the nationwide protest against neo-Nazism. Hundreds of thousands of people and leaders of political parties and mass organizations in the GDR gave a decisive "no" to neo-fascism and revanchism and came out in support of the profound democratic changes in the Republic, on the basis of socialism, and for maintaining the GDR as a sovereign, independent state and for friendship with the Soviet Union.

Having expressed the Soviet people's feelings of solidarity with and support for the citizens of the GDR and their determination to deal a rebuff to neo-Nazis and revanchists, the USSR Foreign Ministry expressed the assurance that all the peoples of Europe and all who have a hatred of fascism and who come out in favor of building a Europe of peace and cooperation will by joint efforts place a reliable barrier in the path of the rebirth of neo-Nazism.

Attempt To Oust Najibullah Denied

LD0401173290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1543 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—Today, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said reports being published in Pakistani newspapers claiming that Moscow had inspired attempts to stage a coup in Kabul for the purpose of getting rid of Afghan President Najibullah were conjectures, the absurdity of which is quite evident.

He reported that the investigation initiated in connection with the recent plot exposed in Kabul has, at its disposal, the plan, the evidence of the plotters, membership cards of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan, and letters containing instructions to party members on carrying out specific antigovernment measures. These documents convincingly testify to the fact that the supervision of the plot was personally carried out by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, leader of the so-called "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," directly from Peshawar. Among those arrested are traders, members of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, nonparty people, civil servants, and Armed Forces personnel. The involvement of the majority of them with the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" has been proven.

Kasparov Remarks on Mongolia

LD0401161990 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at today's briefing again addressed PLAYBOY's interview with world chess champion Gari Kasparov. In that interview Kasparov suggested as a "fantastic idea" that Mongolia be sold to China.

Gerasimov said that these suggestions are an insult to citizens of the Mongolian People's Republic.

Mongolia is a sovereign state, and no one can decide its destiny, even as a joke. Incidentally, there is no evidence that Kasparov was joking, Gerasimov said.

He said that the present "game of chess against Kasparov by correspondence" has not prompted a response from the world champion.

"We have already made the third move, but there is no response from Kasparov. Meanwhile he is running into time trouble and a big scandal may break out," Gerasimov said.

The spokesman had earlier said that Kasparov's fantastic ideas have nothing in common with the Soviet official stance.

Shevardnadze Reviews General Assembly Session

LD0401152190 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze singles out the adoption of Resolution 44/21 by the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly on November 15 as one of the major events of the past year.

This was the first resolution co-sponsored by the Soviet Union and the United States since the founding of the United Nations, marking the end to their roles as irreconcilable opponents as regards the majority of resolutions, Shevardnadze writes in this year's first issue of the Soviet weekly MOSCOW NEWS.

He believes that this was the first resolution in which the Soviet Union and the United States expressed readiness to cooperate in order to further strengthen the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security. This coordinated step contributed much to the peace-making potential of the organisation.

On November 15, 1989, the United Nations drew considerably closer to the realisation of the goal of its founders, Shevardnadze emphasises.

"Iron Curtain" fragments have not yet been scrapped, Shevardnadze points out. Judging by everything, they have stuck in the minds of the adherents of the imperial position-of-strength policy—those who are not averse to bullying neighbouring countries, to breaking the inviolability of embassies of sovereign countries or to trampling on the sprouts of people's freedom.

Describing the work of the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly, Shevardnadze recalls that the U.N. expressed deep regret over the U.S. invasion of Panama.

The session also focussed on urgent humanitarian aid to Romania. A special U.N. session in December dealt with efforts to dismantle apartheid in South Africa.

On the whole, U.N. resolutions, Shevardnadze believes, determined the present-day aganda of the international community: the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional arms, and the efforts to combat ecological danger and to settle regional conflicts.

Someone, disappointed with the U.N.'s ability to ensure peace, has described the U.N. as a paper mill producing more than a billion pages of text a year, Shevardnadze writes. This is unjust in general and wrong altogether when applied to 1989: The results of U.N. efforts are quite tangible.

Kashlev on European Changes, Common Home Idea

PM0401125190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Professor Yu. Kashlev, USSR deputy first deputy foreign minister (title as published), by A. Bezruchenko under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "Europe Awaits Fulfillment of Promises"; date and place not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Bezruchenko] Yuriy Borisovich, bearing in mind the recent changes in the socialist countries, to what extent is their role in the all-European process changing?

[Kashlev] It is changing fundamentally. After all, under their former leaders, delegations from countries such as Romania and the GDR experienced considerable discomfort at international forums. And it was not always easy for us to find common ground with them, because we were then ahead of them in democratization and perestroyka. Our GDR comrades, for instance, had difficulties in discussing questions relating to contacts between people or "Helsinki groups." The position of the Romanian delegations, guided by very strict antediluvian orthodox directives from Bucharest, was particularly difficult.

So the situation will naturally change next year. Countries which have lived through revolutionary changes are stating their desire to move toward European commonality [obshchnost Yevropy], and Poland and Hungary have even asked to be accepted as members of the Council of Europe.

[Bezruchenko] What do we need to do in order to ensure that the USSR's participation in building the common European hope is weightier?

[Kashlev] We need to build a home in which human rights are respected. Here too we are lagging behind. In a few days' time it will be the anniversary of the Vienna meeting at which the Soviet Union made specific pledges, stating from lofty rostrums that in 1989 the USSR would adopt laws on human rights. A year has passed and the promises remain unfulfilled, although two draft laws have been passed by the Supreme Soviet on first reading.

Of course, parliament has other important matters too, but we need to keep our word—in Latin, "pacta sunt servanda" (treaties must be observed). All the more so as our economic and political relations with the West largely depend on them. That is why I want to recall Shevardnadze's appeal to deputies to urgently examine and adopt laws on entry to and exit from the country, on freedom of conscience, and on social organizations (incidentally, when the draft of the latter was being elaborated, I saw no formula similar to Article 6 of the Constitution).

We are also failing to fulfill certain other pledges made in Vienna, and the situation must be rectified in the new

year. For instance, we must urgently publish all laws and ordinances concerning freedom of movement both within the country and abroad (this is something else that we should have done but failed to do this year). In general we need to publish all documents on human rights. We must complete what remains to be done in the practical sphere. After all, we are still reminded by the West of the existence of political prisoners (although not in its "pure form," as was the case before) and of violations in the sphere of psychiatry and religious freedoms. Only by fulfilling all this can we become full participants in the building of the all-European home.

French View of European Integration Welcomed

PM0301152590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch under the "Abroad" rubric: "Francois Mitterrand: Building a New Europe"]

[Text] Paris—French President Francois Mitterrand has proposed creating a "European confederation" in the nineties, based on the Helsinki agreements, to include all the countries of our continent, both East and West. Thus, the president emphasized, together they will form a common permanent organization serving the interests of peace, security, and exchange.

Delivering a New Year's message to the French people, Mitterrand devoted his main attention to the future of Europe. He pointed out that the creation of a "European confederation" would take place in two stages. The first involves consolidating the structures of the 12-country EEC, and the second an alliance of all European states. This will be possible, according to the president, after party pluralism is introduced in the East European countries, free elections are held, and freedom of information is ensured. "Considering the speed at which events are developing," he said, "this obviously will occur quite rapidly."

Describing the changes taking place in socialist countries as one of the most important events in human history, the French president specially noted M.S. Gorbachev's role in these processes.

Europe, he went on to say, will not be as we have known it for the last 50 years. Just as everyone eventually returns home, so Europe will return to its history and geography. In this connection, Mitterrand pointed out, new questions are cropping up: What is the future of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, what will be the rate of disarmament, and in what form and under what conditions will the unification of the German people take place?

Mitterrand's proposal also is regarded here as a response to the U.S. doctrine of "new Atlanticism" set out recently in West Berlin by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. This doctrine envisages a more active role for NATO in West European affairs, particularly in the military-political and economic spheres, along with the conclusion of U.S.-EEC agreements. However, France does not want an increase in Washington's influence in the EEC, whereby the United States would be the "13th member." That, it is believed on the banks of the Seine, could radically change the nature of the EEC.

The first responses indicate that the French head of state's proposal to create a "European confederation" has met with a positive assessment. It has also been supported by Jacques Delors, chairman of the EEC Commission. It is believed in France that this proposal develops General de Gaulle's idea of a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Mitterrand's idea, LIBERATION writes, is close to the Soviet concept of a "common European home," which is also based on the Helsinki agreements. Observers note that during the recent Soviet-French summit meeting in Kiev, Mitterrand supported the Soviet leader's proposal to hold a "Helsinki-2" conference this year and stated subsequently that it could be held in Paris.

It is quite obvious that France is counting on Gorbachev, LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS magazine pointed out in turn, commenting on Mitterrand's recent proposal. Paris, the magazine writes, has an insuperable desire for a firm alliance with Russia.

It is Moscow and Paris, in the opinion of observers, that intend to act as the main architects of the Europe of the future, strive to overcome the division of the old continent, and promote the development of common European processes in all directions. I would remind you: The two countries founded the CSCE, and last summer at the Paris conference on humanitarian problems they advocated creating an area for legal cooperation in Europe.

Mitterrand's new initiative is an important step toward building a united Europe, as a community of sovereign democratic states, and establishing new East-West relations. The "common European home," the French president said recently, "is assuming a concrete form before our eyes."

United States & Canada

Bush Extends Sanctions Against Libya Again

LD0501093990 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 5 Jan 90

[Text] Washington January 5 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash:

United States President George Bush has extended economic sanctions against Libya for another year.

The sanctions were first introduced by former U.S. President Ronald Reagan on January 7, 1986.

This action was justified with standard allegations that this small Arab country, which is thousands miles away from the United States, "poses a threat to national security and vital U.S. foreign- policy interests."

A special presidential letter to both U.S. Congressional leaders notifying the lawmakers about he extension of sanctions against Libya alleges that Libya continues to promote and support internatinal terrorism.

However, it was the United States air forces that brutally bombed Tripoli in 1986, inflicting considerable material damage and killing several Libyans.

Escalating tensions in the region, Washington has also concentrated a large naval strike force in the Mediterranean, including aircraft carriers with nuclear armed fighter-bombers, which threatens Libya's sovereignty and independence.

The U.S. sanctions against Libya include freezing of hundreds of millions of dollars of Libyan assets in U.S. banks and banning weapons sales, credits and contracts with U.S. companies based in Libya.

The sanctions are extremely aggressive and are an inherent part of the U.S. hegemonic policy against the Arab people fighting for independence.

KGB to 'Expand Contacts' With CIA, Others

LD0401123890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1159 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—"In 1990 the KGB plans to expand contacts with special services of various countries, in particular with the CIA," a correspondent of the weekly MOSKOVSKIY NOVOSTI [Moscow News] was told by Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security. According to him, this will be primarily aimed at thwarting terrorism, the drugs trade, and smuggling.

If the USSR and the United States have a joint interest in lowering tension in the planet's "hot spots" the KGB and CIA may exchange intelligence information in order to devise and undertake joint action by the governments of our countries, the head of the committee noted.

Administration Allegedly Fears Noriega Testimony

PM0401164590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by V. Nadein in Washington and M. Kozhukhov in Moscow: "General Noriega to Stand Trial"]

[Text] Panamanian Television interrupted its programs on the evening of 3 January to broadcast a news flash. General Manuel Antonio Noriega, Panama's former military leader, had surrendered to representatives of the U.S. forces, having voluntarily left the papal nuncio's residence where he had stayed in hiding over the last 10 days.

According to REUTER reports, Noriega was immediately moved to one of the U.S. military bases in the Panama Canal Zone and flown to Florida, where he will stand trial. According to the UPI story, representatives of the U.S. command in Panama agreed to meet three conditions raised by the general before surrendering to the victors' mercy: the right to remain in military uniform, the absence of journalists at the time of arrest, and the possibility of communicating by telephone with his family.

"Noriega's capture and his extradition to the United States is a clear sign that the United States is fully resolved to ensure the triumph of justice over those accused of drugs trafficking"—that was how U.S. President George Bush commented the news of the general's arrest at an urgently convened short briefing in the White House.

Manuel Antonio Noriega is 51 years old. For almost 7 years, while commanding Panama's National Defense Forces, he was the country's "strong man." At the same time, hardly any other foreign leader caused more open irritation in Washington than the Panamanian general. He was accused of corruption, arms dealing, violations of human rights, election rigging—but Noriega just shrugged off these accusations. In his compatriots' eyes he remained a national hero upholding Panama's independence from the United States, which was interested in maintaining its military bases in the Panama Canal Zone. His critics claimed that the general's sole ideology consisted of anti-Americanism, a leaning toward the occult, and a thirst for power. It is claimed that, when he was preparing his diploma thesis, Noriega wrote that he wanted to become either president of the republic or a psychiatrist. He did become de facto president, but retained psychiatry as his hobby, being rather keen on psychological operations—the art of which he learned at the U.S. military base at Fort Bragg. Back in 1975 he even published an 80-page textbook on psychological experiments, expressing in it admiration for... Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh, and Genghis Khan.

Now the Panamanian general is to stand trial with a possible sentence of 145 years in prison and a fine of $1.5 million. The charges filed against him in Miami cover about a dozen offenses: aiding and abetting the

Colombian drugs mafia in the transportation of several tonnes of cocaine and marijuana to U.S. territory, which apparently earned the general a reward of $5 million; involvement in the laundering of gigantic sums of drugs dollars in Panamanian banks; and the use of Panamanian territory as a staging post in operations by "drugs barons."

Will the general's trial be honest and impartial, as Washington claims today? Noriega's lawyers express doubts about the triumph of justice at this trial, bearing in mind, first, the extreme public hostility to the former Panamanian leader, and second, fears that the general will demand a public hearing which is hardly likely to suit Washington, which is not too keen on publicizing the information held by Noriega—a former paid agent of the CIA who had at least two meetings with Bush while the latter headed the U.S. intelligence agency. It is assumed that the general's services were associated with passing on to Washington confidential information about the activity of a number of Central American governments and Cuba. According to U.S. press reports, Noriega was a paid agent of the CIA as late as 1983, when he headed Panama's National Defense Forces...

And so, the main objective of the U.S. invasion of Panama—to get rid of Noriega—has been achieved. But will Washington succeed in just as easily getting rid of the former CIA agent's testimony? By all accounts, both sides know a lot about each other that they are unwilling to share with other parties.

Bush Seen 'Ill at Ease' Over Noriega, Panama

PM0401174190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jan 90 First Edition pp 1,5

[Report by own correspondent V. Gan: "In Accordance with the 'Big Stick' Law"]

[Text] Washington, 4 Jan—The U.S. Administration has announced the "triumphant" attainment of the goal of the armed invasion of Panama. In the evening, at around 2200 hours, President G. Bush appeared in person to address the correspondents on duty in the White House and read out a hastily put together statement on a "significant milestone" in operation "Just Cause"—Washington's hypocritical name for its act of aggression against a sovereign state.

The president announced that at approximately 2050 General Noriega, who had taken refuge in the nunciature in Panama, had voluntarily surrendered to the U.S. authorities "with the knowledge of the Panamanian government." Noriega was taken to the U.S. Howard Air Force Base, on Panamanian territory. He was arrested there by agents of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration. The general was then put on a U.S. Air Force C-130 aircraft, which immediately took off for Homestead base in Florida. Bush announced that Noriega will appear before the U.S. district court in Miami on charges connected with his "involvement" in international drug trafficking.

Having promised a "fair trial" for the general, the president saw fit to talk about U.S. "dedication" to certain political, diplomatic, and moral principles, although it is absolutely clear that by attacking Panama Washington flouted all conceivable principles and norms of international law.

This is the international community's assessment of the recurrence of the U.S. imperial "big stick" policy. But on the Potomac the universal condemnation of U.S. aggression did not make much of an impression. Moreover, the White House incumbent made it absolutely clear that the United States will be prepared to use similar methods in the future if it decides that someone is a "drug trafficker."

But it is hard to shake off the impression that the president did not feel entirely at ease. At any event, one noticed Bush's constant emphasis on the start of the withdrawal of U.S. occupation troops from Panamanian territory, the efforts to bring about Panama's "economic and political rebirth," and the intention in the future to give the Panamanian people "assistance and support." But, try as the Washington propagandists might, aggression is aggression and "gunboat diplomacy" is "gunboat diplomacy," which has nothing to do with a great power's responsibility to the world.

And another thing. Following the abortive U.S. attempt last October to organize a military coup to overthrow Noriega, Bush was accused of lacking "willpower" and "daring." The operation that ended in the general's arrest was, at least from the military-political viewpoint, a success for the president in the eyes of the Americans who supported the invasion. But, as ABC television reported, the understandable enthusiasm among the president's entourage is by no means shared in U.S. intelligence circles. According to published data, the CIA possesses 35-40 volumes of facts relating to Noriega's cooperation with U.S. special services, which has been going on for 20 years.

According to ABC, in the course of the forthcoming Noriega trial one must expect some "dirty linen to be washed in public." This could lead to the appearance of "delicate" information, which could embarrass more than one official in Washington. It is true that the CIA conducted a special investigation to ascertain whether there was anything that might compromise Bush, who was head of that department in the very years when Panamanian intelligence was led by Noriega, who met with the future U.S. president in 1977. It is claimed that the White House has no grounds for concern. In any case, during the trial the administration can always put a ban on the publication of particular data, by citing "national security interests." There are plenty of precedents for this.

As for Noriega himself, he faces charges in courts in Tampa and Miami. The list of charges is long. And if the general is found guilty on all counts, he faces a jail term of 145 years and a fine of over $1 million.

TASS Cites U.S. 'Crimes' in Latin America

LD0401125690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1150 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—TASS observer Gennadiy Petrov writes:

Following the voluntary surrender by General Noriega to the U.S. troops surrounding the Papal nunciature, the occupation of Panama by U.S. servicemen continues. As the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN says today that the Republic of Panama now resembles a state under siege.

Meanwhile, Pentagon strategists are analyzing the results of the armed invasion of this small Central American country. A report from a Washington ABC TV correspondent notes tnat U.S. generals consider this operation was better planned than the 1983 intervention in Grenada. At the same time, U.S. military leaders concede that during the aggressive action in Panama "a number of problems arose which remain to be resolved in the future."

The questions arise: What future is meant? For what new piece of adventurism was the invasion of Panama by "GI's" and their provocative actions against the diplomatic representatives of Nicaragua and Cuba a rehearsal? Where else does Washington plan to "restore democracy," American style?

Despite the protests of the majority of members of the world community against the piratical action in Panama, it seems that Washington will continue to regard the countries of Latin America as its backyard and impose its orders on them by fire and sword.

Panama is the latest in the long list of victims of U.S. crimes. Incidentally, the aggression against this sovereign state took place close to the anniversary of the bloody carnage committed by U.S. troops against demonstrators on 9 January 1964 near the Canal Zone. And before that there was the Bay of Pigs (Cuba) invasion, aggression against Costa Rica, intervention by American mercenaries in Guatemala, and the suppression of an uprising in Puerto Rico...the dossier of crimes is large. The United States has resorted more than 60 times to military action in Central America.

History testifies that the method of using force by no means always produces the desired results, and even if this succeeds it merely brings temporary "victories." However, successive administrations in Washington invariably keep to the policy of the "big stick," and do not wish to see an alternative to this course. They thus poison the international climate and complicate the world situation.

Bush Interviewed on Soviet, E. Europe Changes

PM0501091790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jan 90 First Edition p1

[TASS report: "G. Bush Interview"]

[Text] New York, 3 Jan—U.S. President G. Bush has given an interview to a group of editors from the monthly, THE READER'S DIGEST, in which he described the "fantastically rapid changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union" as the most encouraging international events since the time he took up office. "I want restructuring to be crowned with success and I want cooperation with the Soviet Union," he said, remarking that the United States "welcomes Gorbachev's reforms and openness."

Bush said that the United States does not pose a threat to the Soviet Union but, at the same time, he stressed the need to "preserve NATO's might." He made it clear that he does not intend to radically lower the level of U.S. military expenditure or abandon plans for the modernization of strategic nuclear forces, while, it is true, expressing willingness to "hold talks with the aim of concluding a verifiable agreement on reducing these arms."

According to the President, the problem causing the most concern in the U.S. Administration is the absence of progress in the struggle against the drug business. "I am disappointed that the drug problem has assumed terrifying proportions not only in our country but throughout the world," he said.

Touching on the prospect of the two German states unifying in some form or another, the President said: "This question must be decided by the Germans themselves. The reunification of Germany is one of NATO's longstanding objectives. But the United States must not try to dictate its conditions."

China

Soviet-PRC Cooperation Since Gorbachev Visit

OW0401231090 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Review of major events in Soviet-Chinese cooperation since Gorbachev's visit to China—from the "Taking the Road of Friendship and Cooperation" program]

[Text] In July 1989, the fourth meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technological Cooperation was held in Moscow. At the meeting, the two sides exchanged opinions on formulating a long-term cooperative plan up to the year 2000 in the fields of economy, trade, science, and technology. They also put forth specific ideas and proposals on establishing ties in various spheres, such as energy including atomic energy, communications, transportation, electronics, production of civilian products, lumber-processing industry, and agriculture. Both sides

expressed intention of promoting and reinforcing cooperation and establishing joint ventures, and gave a positive appraisal of the development of contacts between the border regions of the Soviet Union and China.

In July this year, a Chinese exhibition on science and technology took place in Moscow. Exhibits featuring China's achievements in the last 10 years of reform were provided by 27 ministries and departments of the Chinese government and 11 Chinese provinces and autonomous regions. The exhibition was a real success.

In November, a delegation from the Heilongjiang Provicial People's Government headed by Governor Shao Qihui made an official goodwill visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. During the visit, the two sides discussed the current situation and the prospects for further development of mutually beneficial cooperation of RSFSR's ministries, departments, border regions, oblasts, and enterprises with their partners in Heilongjiang in the fields of economy, trade, culture, science, and technology.

The visit to the Soviet Union in October by a delegation of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions led by its President Ni Zhifu added a new page to the annals of cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese trade unions. At a meeting between the delegation and the Soviet trade union leaders, both sides pointed out that the Soviet and Chinese reform processes have many things in common, which provide a broad prospect for cooperation between the trade unions of the two countries.

In October, a delegation from the All-Union Komsomol, led by Mironenko, first secretary of its central committee, made an official visit to China. In the talks held in Beijing, the two sides discussed the prospects of cooperation between Komsomol and China's Communist Youth League in various fields.

The agreement on contacts between the Chinese and Soviet Communist parties reached on Gorbachev's visit to China in May this year has been put into practice. A delegation from the CPC Central Committee visited the Soviet Union, while a CPSU Central Committee delegation headed by Falin, chairman of the International Policy Commission, visited China.

Dear Chinese friends, we have stated some events in Soviet-Chinese relations since the summit was held in Beijing. These events prove that the agreements reached at the summit are being smoothly carried out. Cooperation between our two countries is developing steadily and is being gradually expanded to include more and more spheres.

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Interviews Japanese Foreign Minister

PM0401131590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama by own correspondent I. Latyshev: "Bright Prospects Opening Up"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Latyshev] How do you assess the changes that have occurred in the international situation in 1989?

[Nakayama] The international situation in 1989 has been marked by big—in fact, historic—changes in East-West relations and in the situation in Eastern Europe. The past year can be described as the year of the beginning of efforts aimed at creating a new international structure based on the progressive development of American-Soviet relations and the abandonment of the confrontation of the cold war years.

As far as Europe is concerned, the sharp, dramatic changes in the situation in Eastern Europe constitute a historical process highly charged with opportunities to reorganize the order that has prevailed there in the postwar years. This process is irreversible, being determined, as USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Gorbachev himself remarked in Malta, by "objective historical necessity."

As a result major changes in the structure of the East-West confrontation that has prevailed in the postwar period will clearly take place. The pro-liberalization movement manifested in the demolition of the Berlin Wall—that symbol of East-West confrontation—has developed at a speed exceeding all expectations and will clearly spread even further to all East European countries.

Such dramatic changes open up bright prospects for the development of East-West relations, but also produce an unstable situation. In such circumstances the talks held in Malta are of great importance in the sense that they helped strengthen personal trust between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union. Our country very much hopes that there will be progress in East-West relations and acceleration of the future course of American-Soviet talks as a result of the Malta talks.

On the other hand, however, a global approach is required in assessing the development of East-West relations. Particularly in Asia and the Pacific—though there is normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations and progress in settling the Cambodian problem, regional questions and also political confrontation remain unresolved and unsettled, which is a cause of instability.

This also applies to the sphere of Japanese-Soviet relations, which are an important part of East-West relations and also an integral factor in ensuring peace and stability in the Asian and Pacific region. Although active efforts

to normalize and radically improve our two countries' relations are being made, they have still not produced substantial results.

[Latyshev] How do you regard prospects for the development of the international situation and Japanese diplomacy in 1990 and subsequent years?

[Nakayama] Regarding the international situation at the start of the nineties, as I have already remarked, it is necessary to impart a global character to the current processes of structural changes in relations between East and West, extending them to the Asian and Pacific region. Moreover, thus far American-Soviet relations and the situation in Europe are still to some extent unclear and unstable. So that the interested parties need to make efforts to ensure peace and stability in the future.

Moreover, the international community of today is contending with new problems like the destruction of the environment, enormous unpaid debts, international terrorism, the spread of drugs, and so forth. To tackle these problems, which are becoming serious on a global scale, emergency measures are needed aimed at creating a system of broad international cooperation to be carried out in the future regardless of whether a country belongs to East or West.

As far as Japan is concerned, it has acquired in today's world, which is undergoing such major changes on the eve of the 21st Century, economic power exceeding 10 percent of the world's GNP and has become one of the countries bearing the brunt of responsibility for maintaining international order. Given these circumstances, Japan is fully resolved to play an even more active role than before in promoting the peace and prosperity of the whole world.

Regarding concrete measures aimed at ensuring that our country contributes what it can to the common cause of the world community, we are intent on making even more concrete efforts to implement the "concept of peaceful cooperation," that is, "cooperation in the name of peace" based on our country's active involvement in securing and maintaining worldwide peace. This likewise involves the implementation of the "Expansion of Governmental Development Aid" program, which is designed to assist the progress of developing countries, and also the realization of the "Expansion of International Cultural Exchange" program, which is aimed at promoting mutual understanding among representatives of different cultures as quickly as possible. We are also seeking to play an active part in tackling such global problems as the environment.

It is particularly important, in my view, to endeavor to develop international cooperation in the sphere of medicine, seeking to ensure that that all mankind can lead a healthy and correct way of life. Our country intends to decisively expand international cooperation in this sphere. We will therefore train experienced medical cadres and draw up our own country's program in cooperation with the UN Children's Fund and other relevant organizations.

Regarding Japanese-Soviet relations, we are fully resolved to make maximum efforts to normalize and fundamentally improve our bilateral relations, which are called upon to help stability between East and West and to make a contribution to the cause of peace and stability in Asia and the Pacific. We are convinced that such Japanese-Soviet relations will promote the happiness and prosperity of both our country and the people of the Soviet Union, which is now engaged in perestroyka.

Soviet Ambassador to Japan Solovyev Interviewed

OW0501090490 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 3 Jan 89

[Text] Solovyev, Soviet ambassador to Japan, granted a New Year interview to the KYODO NEWS AGENCY. In this inteview, the Soviet ambassador called for expanding trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union.

The ambassador issued an appeal that Japan's territorial demand on the Soviet Union should not be used as a precondition for concluding a peace treaty or for promoting diversified economic cooperation between the two nations.

Ambassador Solovyev stated that Japan is merely trying to insist on its own demand now, and expressed that in that case, there will be no essential advance in cooperation in economic, technological, and other fields. Then, the ambassador added that the Soviet Union has been dealing with this issue with an understanding of Japan's position but that the Soviet Union does have legitimate rights on these territories when it is considered from historical or legal viewpoints. And while calling for overcoming a certain mutual distrust that has been formed historically between the Soviet Union and Japan, the ambassador also stated that the Soviet Union and Japan must take initiative in cooperating with each other on promoting disarmament and easing military confrontation in the Asian-Pacific region.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Technology Minister Arrives for Talks

LD0401180790 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov:

"Scientific potentials of the USSR and Israel permit our two countries to successfully develop mutually advantageous contacts in the sphere of science and technology", Ezer Weizmann, Israeli minister of science and technology, said in an interview given at the Sheremetievo

Airport. He arrived here today at the invitation of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The purpose of the first visit of the Israeli minister to the USSR is to examine opportunities for the establishment of bilateral scientific contacts on a permanent basis. A programme of his visit includes meetings with senior executives of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and with Soviet scientists, as well as visits to research institutions of Moscow and Leningrad.

"The strengthening of cooperation with the Soviet Union in the sphere of science and technology, the development of relations with Soviet scientists and the organisation of the exchange of scientific and technical information are just a few questions of those which we are going to study. Possible cooperation in space exploration is of special interest to us. I hope that my visit to the USSR will pave the way to my colleagues for signing agreements," Ezer Weizmann said.

Najibullah Lauds USSR's Self-Sacrifices

PM0401153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Special correspondents V. Sevruk and S. Sevruk account of interview with President Najibullah of Afghanistan, under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "Najibullah: Peace Is a Blessing"—place, date of interview not given; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] President Najibullah avoided talking about his own revolutionary career during our meeting last April. This does not fit in with our Afghan customs, he said, and time was pressing. The siege of Jalalabad was under way, the stronghold of Samarkhel [name as transliterated] had been surrendered, the highway to Hayraton had been cut off. Every minute was at a premium, and it would have been improper to complain about the president's inattention toward IZVESTIYA.

The highways to both Hayraton and Jalalabad are open today, the latest attack on the city has been successfully repulsed, and a truck convoy carrying flour, fuel, and ammunition has got through to Herat.

There is also news of an altogether peaceful nature—the new highway between Kabul and Bagram is being asphalted, the first visitors have at long last arrived in the 14-story House of Communications whose foundations were laid way back under Daud, specialists in the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Mining are working hard on technical and economic projects for developing the Aynak copper ore deposit which was discovered by Afghan and Soviet geologists. A deposit which, incidentally, is one of the world's richest in terms of copper reserves. The "Afghanfilm" movie studio has completed several feature and documentary movies....

You probably think that I read my way through Marxist booklets, spent some time inside for a couple of seditious speeches, and thus became a revolutionary, President Najibullah quipped. There is also the other theory, according to which only the have-nots are attracted to revolution and every revolution has its origins in poverty. I am convinced that revolutions have their origins in life, in people's personal economic and political experience. Everyone has his own different experience. For example, there are people writing that we Afghan revolutionaries are putschists, that we rushed into revolution for the sake of our personal careers, and other suchlike rubbish.

Some of us could have led a life of plenty even under the former regimes, and many could not have complained about their positions.

Obviously, man's makeup is such that if the humane elements within him are predominant he does not think only of his own little patch but takes a broader look at the world. And shares other people's pain as if it were his own.

I do not mean just the Marxists. Look at the martyrs of Islam, the Christian missionaries. Did they suffer just for the sake of their own well-being? In my view, social thinking now is so dogmatized that it is incapable of analyzing and explaining the motives which prompt human activity. I mean both Marxism and the teachings opposing it.

How did I become a revolutionary? I was a student at a Kabul lyceum, my father was serving in Peshawar, and I traveled to visit him during vacations every year. We usually stopped for a break somewhere beyond Jalalabad. Everyone rested near a crystal-clear waterfall. Women usually went a little higher up, the men stayed separately at the foot of the slope. On one occasion, a woman ran down the path and shouted at one of the men: Your wife has given birth to a son. Everybody made their way up the slope. And I watched how, just 20 minutes later, the woman who had given birth got up on her feet, wrapped her son in a shawl, and was on her way with the caravan of nomads. I sensed an inner shock, I shivered. What is this, I thought to myself, why should an Afghan woman give birth out in the open, among the rocks, like a stray animal! Believe me, I was not thinking of any revolution at the time, I was simply gripped by anger and shame. After all, I loved my land and my people. Why should my people lead a worse life than the rest of mankind? At that time, you see, back in the seventies, the Afghans' per capita income was only $46-50 a year.

After graduating from the lyceum, I enrolled in the Kabul University Medical Faculty induction course. I did not join any political groupings but, to be honest, I felt a pull toward public life. When the time came to elect the University Students' Council, I put forward my own nomination. My platform was simple—for the Afghan nation's prosperity, democracy, and so forth. Without really expecting it, I gained a majority of votes at the election. While on the Students' Council, I got close to

guys from the People's Democratic Party. If anything, I was attracted by their personal selflessness and tolerance.

We were opposed by members of the "Young Muslims of Afghanistan." This is the Afghan offshoot of the famous fundamentalist party "Muslim Brotherhood," which has been outlawed in many Arab countries for fanatical terrorism and pursuit of power.

The "Young Muslims" in Afghanistan assassinated dozens of our comrades in Kabul, Paghman, and Herat. This angered the young souls, and some were gripped by an all-consuming thought of retribution and vengeance for the blood that had been shed. Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, leader of the "Young Muslims of Afghanistan" at the time, now heads the most fundamentalist grouping of the implacable opposition—the Islamic Party of Afghanistan. Thus, we have been at daggers drawn for many years now.

Nonetheless, our April Revolution in 1978 claimed the minimum of victims, and not just in Kabul where the insurgents encountered armed resistance. It is not true that the masses stood aside from the revolution. Hundreds of people marched behind every insurgent tank. The people in the provinces fraternized with the revolutionary troops. You see, there was virtually not a single shot fired anywhere in the country, nobody acted against the revolutionary army, and the army itself did not produce any solid group daring to resist and capable of expecting success. It is laughable and sad to read how apparently educated people and authoritative current affairs writers tailor events in Afghanistan at the time to fit outdated paragraphs from dusty textbooks. One is then entitled to ask: What about the 1952 revolution in Egypt, should it be banned and the country returned to the times of King Faruq? But what about the Nonaligned Movement, should it also be banned, how can the revolutions in Iran, Libya, Syria, and Iraq be proclaimed "illegal?" Bring back the past?

What amazes me is the fact that writers on Afghanistan are primarily people who have no knowledge of our language, our history, our religion, our heroes, and our martyrs. Ignorance in evaluations is dangerous, it engenders grievances capable of evolving into enmity. Is this realized by those who write ill about what they do not know and do not understand?

I recently read in a Soviet newspaper that Hafizullah Amin was apparently a great friend of the Soviet Union and all but one of the great Marxists. Let the author of these lines say this aloud in Kabul's famous Green Market. How can anyone describe as friend of the Land of the Soviets someone who butchered the people, shot people in their hundreds, and slammed thousands of detainees in prison? Is this the way your writers perceive the "new thinking?" What does this mean—are we Afghan revolutionaries, who took a stance against mass terror and the gross trampling of Islamic traditions and national customs, retrograde or what?

After all, one-fourth of party members were destroyed by Amin for the simple reason that they were unwilling to exterminate their own people. Think of the slaughter to which the military were subjected! The army did not know whom to believe, it was prepared to unite with anyone convenient just in order to save the lives of soldiers and officers. That was the situation just before 27 December 1979.

I am not familiar with details of the circumstances surrounding the entry of Soviet troops. I was abroad, in Yugoslavia at the time. I share the appraisal of the entire dramatic history of Soviet-Afghan relations made by President Mikhail Gorbachev, Afghanistan's great and sincere friend. I agree with his words about the grandeur and courage of Soviet internationalist soldiers.

Both external and internal factors play their role in the process of revolution and their positions cannot be reversed, because only the internal impulses of struggle and development have the final say, they are the ones shaping the determining trend of changes. However, there is no need to constantly hark back to the past, one single practical step forward is today more valuable than the most critical appraisals of the past. Even though this is necessary in order to avoid repeating past mistakes.

Let us leave past events and facts to history. My thoughts are now concentrated on one aspect—how can can we achieve peace in the country as soon as possible and solve the problems concerning Afghanistan in Afghanistan itself and by the Afghans themselves.

We all had a Muslim upbringing in our childhood and youth. That was our way of life and our way of thinking. After all, Islam emerged as a form of protest against oppression, lack of rights, poverty, and bloody feuds. A revolution can only be with the people, not above the people. The Afghan nation is an Islamic nation. Therefore, the Afghan revolutionaries are bound not only to bear the principles of Islam in mind but also to constantly follow them. When you approach the people not through belief but for reasons of political tactics, your success will be short-lived, the people will quickly realize whether you really are with them or only wish to gain advantage and power at their expense. Our people are now passionately yearning for peace. This is the essence of the Koran. The Prophet said: PEACE IS A BLESSING.

I know that Afghanistan has many sincere friends in your country who have devoted their talent, labor, and courage to the cause of Afghan-Soviet cooperation. They are people aware of our difficulties and concerns, of our traditions and customs. I mean the thousands of Soviet specialists, as well as Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov, esteemed representatives of the top Soviet leadership. The war will not last for ever. Peace will dawn on our land, and we are convinced that Soviet-Afghan cooperation will get its second wind in many spheres.

We are fully determined to reach the broadest possible compromise. We do not intend to hold on to office. Believe me, the Afghan revolutionaries did not promote the idea of national reconciliation in order to secure their domination beneath popular slogans. They have repeatedly risked their lives for the sake of their beliefs. Do you think that career considerations will force us to change our views of Afghanistan's future as a neutral, nonaligned, islamic country? Never!

We are in favor of the broadest possible coalition of patriotic national forces and we do not demand any privileges for ourselves. All forces of progress, creativity, wisdom, and independence can and must be united by the idea of Afghan statehood. Let all who are trusted by the people come to power—nonparty people and leaders of progressive parties, experienced administrators from previous regimes and the patriotic military.

Strongarm pressure is outdated. This is yesterday's philosophy. It could, of course, be reanimated for a certain length of time at the cost of fresh victims. But what happens afterwards? A blind alley. New political thinking, with the idea of national reconciliation as one of its components—this is the imperative of the time. It is unavoidable.

Afghanistan cannot return to the prefeudal age, obsolete social relations cannot be restored. Otherwise, we will once again have violence and bloodshed. It is necessary to perceive the Afghan future which is rooted in our history, our traditions, and our religion.

Your Supreme Soviet evaluated the decision to introduce Soviet troops in Afghanistan in December 1979. Politicians bear their own responsibility, and it has been mentioned. As for me, I bow my head in honor of the memory of Soviet people who gave their lives in the performance of their duty—soldiers, military and civilian specialists, diplomats and journalists.

The war has brought much sadness. It will not be forgotten overnight. Nor will countless Afghans forget the kindness and courage of Soviet people, their selflessness and humanity. The only thing to be wished is that God forbid the human destinies of Soviet people and Afghans should ever again be intertwined in the battlefield. Let me repeat what the Prophet said: PEACE IS A BLESSING!

'Ice Age' in Relations With Egypt Ends

PM0401145390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 90 p 3

[Special correspondent A. Shumilin dispatch: "End to 'Ice Age.' Egypt Advocates Normalization of Relations With Soviet Union and Arab Countries"]

[Excerpt] Cairo—[Passage omitted] The Israeli Embassy in Cairo is 10 years old. So is the Egyptian-Israeli treaty. What has it given Egypt and the Arabs? Butrus Ghali, minister of state for foreign affairs, accurately formulated his country's stance:

"The first positive aspect is the fact that the peace treaty has been in effect for 10 years already. I would add to this the political will of Cairo and Tel Aviv to keep the peace. Furthermore, I believe that the Egyptian-Israeli treaty prompted other Arab states to adopt moderate positions. I can say with certainty that the PLO's 15 November 1988 decision to recognize Israel and UN Resolutions 242 and 338 and its readiness to begin a dialogue with Israel must be examined in precisely this context. Unfortunately, this peace also has a negative aspect: We have still not solved the Palestinian problem. Israel is reacting negatively to 'Arafat's bold initiative. It is the Palestinian problem that largely determines today's state of relations between Egypt and Israel. Without a solution, or at least steps toward a solution, to the Palestinian problem, our relations will be unable to gain the scope needed to consolidate peace in the region."

While procedural aspects of the trilateral U.S.-Egyptian-Israeli meeting in Washington on the question of Palestinian participation in the Near East political process are being agreed, preliminary contacts between the Palestinians themselves and realistically minded Israelis are taking place in Cairo. Specifically, one of 'Arafat's aides recently met Israeli Member of Parliament L. Eliav.

Political life in the Egyptian capital recorded another important event toward the end of last year. A government statement recently delivered by the prime minister to parliament speaks of a significant improvement in relations between our two countries. "Egypt's relations with the USSR have improved significantly in the recent past thanks to President Gorbachev's policy, which we follow with great attention." This sentence from the government statement is interpreted by local and numerous foreign journalists in Cairo as a sign of Egypt's readiness to embark on a new stage of relations with the USSR following the lengthy period of reciprocal cooling which began in the mid-seventies.

It is only on extremely rare occasions that chance determines major policies. The evolution of these policies is usually the result of natural progress. I am convinced that the cooling of relations between the USSR and Egypt in the seventies was natural. Its causes were numerous, but the insufficient flexibility of our own policy was, in my view, quite a significant one. I mean the ailment which, as is now being admitted, gripped our entire foreign policy activity in those years. Its symptoms were different in different parts of the world. In the Near East, specifically, they took the form of a foreign policy stereotype which was firmly established among our allies: "If it is a question of war—with help from the USSR; if it is a question of peace moves—with help from the United States." By the mid-seventies, Egypt was the

first Arab country to take a line of achieving a peace settlement by political means.

Both sides are drawing conclusions from the "ice age" which developed in our relations. What are our conclusions? I put this question to USSR Ambassador to Egypt G.K. Zhuravlev. This is what he said:

"Of course, blame for what occurred in Soviet-Egyptian relations in the mid-seventies cannot be pinned on just one of the sides. Its background must be reviewed, studied, and analyzed. But this is up to historians. As far as we practitioners are concerned, it is important to realize the abnormality of the situation whereby, just a few years ago, relations between the USSR and the Arab world's largest country were essentially confrontational. It is necessary to realize this and to make efforts to remedy this situation. These relations must once more become relations of friendship and cooperation. Now it is already possible to assert that there are no reciprocal complaints between us. In this context special importance is attached today to the forthcoming official friendly visit to our country by Egyptian President H. Mubarak, the first such visit in almost 2 decades. The meeting between our two countries' political leaders should lay firm foundations for the strengthening and development of our relations in the long term. Both the Soviet Union and Egypt are interested in this."

Commentary Views Mubarak's Visit to Sudan

EA0301183890 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] Husni Mubarak, the president of Egypt, has paid a short visit to Sudan. Vladimir Borisov comments on the visit:

Egypt's president visited Sudan to attend the 34th anniversary of independence of the Arab nation in Africa. His very important visit was not aimed at sharing the tumultuous celebrations with his neighbor. Mubarak's talks with General 'Umar al-Bashir, the head of the Sudanese military regime, were mainly concerned with finding a solution between the central government and the southern Christian rebels.

As is known, President Mubarak earlier agreed to mediate in the proposed Cairo talks between Khartoum and the leader of the People's Liberation Forces, John Garang. Mubarak's mediation effort is important, since Egypt plays the greatest role in Arab affairs, and he is the current OAU chairman. The president said that in Cairo he held talks with the rebels, and there are reliable relations with the north of Sudan. The president said for that reason, his government would do everything possible to bring the two sides to the negotiating table. For that reason, Cairo was a suitable venue for the new round of talks. Other suitable venues are Nairobi and Addis Ababa. These were the venues of the failed talks of August and December last year between the two opposing forces engaged in a 6-year war, in which tens of thousands have perished.

The mediation and search for peace is an important venture. But the most important thing is for the two sides to show their readiness for reconciliation. However, the failed talks and the heating-up of the war do not show genuine goodwill for reconciliation. Khartoum's new government, which came to power halfway through last year, announced its readiness to seek a lasting peace in the south of the country.

The stand of each of the opposing forces is now clear. The central government calls for the country to adopt a federal system, in order to achieve national reconciliation, whereby all sectors concerned will have the right to choose the laws of their choice, whether such laws are based on Islam or are secular. This can be taken as the biggest concession this regime has made, which no previous regime has zade, that is, if the rebels headed by John Garang accepted it. Our commentator says this issue can be described as follows: The rebel leadership calls for the convening of a constitutional conference and the formation of a coalition government. They feel that if the country had a federal system, they would lose their chance to participate in what goes on in Khartoum.

Therefore, if the proposal by the military regime is based on justice, as it appears, then it is a real one. Especially if it is recalled that not all the guerrillas are opposed to a federal system. In addition to this, last month the government announced that the shari'ah laws were being applied throughout the country. They had been stopped long ago. Therefore it can be said that the Christians offered a fait accompli which does not need any revision.

Recently it was announced in Khartoum that there was a plan for holding regional meetings this year in preparation for the formation of the federal system. By establishing a federal system the government aims to withdraw its troops from the south and leave the affairs of the poor south to the southern Christians and the central federal government. That is what Gen 'Umar al-Bashir meant when he announced yesterday that he was concerned that the year 1990 should be one of peace for Sudan, and that the final decade of this century should be an era based on changes and development, uniting all the nationalist forces.

What position will the guerrillas adopt in this strategy? Will the steps being taken on the federal system bring about the division of this largest country in Africa? Some answers to these hard questions will be found from the talks Khartoum is planning to hold in Cairo with the Christian guerrillas. But the question is: Will these talks take place?

Vorontsov Meets UAE Trade, Economy Minister

JN0401163290 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1455 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (WAKH)—Sayf al-Jarwan, minister of trade and economy of the United Arab Emirates [UAE], currently visiting Moscow, met today with Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister.

During the meeting, the two officials reviewed bilateral relations, particularly economic relations, as well as Middle East and Gulf developments.

Al-Jarwan referred to the importance of the economic, trade, and technical cooperation agreement signed by the two countries on 2 January. He stressed the agreement's importance in promoting existing relations, especially since this is the first agreement between the UAE and the Soviet Union—an agreement that will constitute a broad framework for the promotion of cooperation and from which other agreements will emanate to cover various domains of trade, economic, investment, and technical cooperation.

Ministers Send Condolences on Pakistan Rail Crash

LD0401222190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has expressed profound condolences to Prime Minister Bhutto with regard to the major railway disaster which took place in Pakistan on 3 January, and also conveyed sincere sympathy to those who suffered in it and to the bereaved families.

East Europe

Shevardnadze Writes Letter on Romanian Events

PM0401224990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 9 p 1

[Undated letter from USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Editorial Board: "Minister's Reply"]

[Text] Esteemed Editorial Board! For many years a committed reader of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, I could not help but be interested in your paper's pieces on events in Romania.

For instance, on 29 December 1989 it published under the "Announcement!" rubric a note containing several questions which I think I should reply to. But, first of all, allow me to take a broader look at the events.

They certainly have been extraordinary—a turning point in the life of a friendly neighboring country. The people have risen up and overthrown a totalitarian regime and are exercising the right to freely choose their path of development. Young people performed an enormous role in this bloody struggle, particularly at its decisive stage.

The National Salvation Front now has power firmly in its hands and is carrying out democratic transformations and implementing plans to build a new Romania with amazing speed. Naturally, at this difficult time, the Romanian patriots need the support of their allies and of the entire international community. The Soviet government immediately recognized the National Salvation Front Council and established permament contact with it via our embassy. The new Romanian leadership noted the other day, in conversation with our representative, the "sensitive, intelligent stance of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and M.S. Gorbachev during the decisive period."

It can now be said that in the situation of mounting crisis the moribund Ceausescu regime virtually accused the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries of organizing antigovernment actions in Romania and of interfering in its internal affairs. We could not allow them to have anything to support such "arguments."

The events in Romania have had a profound effect on Soviet people. They immediately raise questions, including questions concerning the activity of our diplomatic service.

Comrades are asking how it could have happened that the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet was forced to note that information on the events in Romania in the initial days was incomplete and confusing, and whether our embassy or the Foreign Ministry were not to blame for this.

In the broadest terms I want to say that this is not the first occasion in history when the sudden commencement and development of events has prevented an accurate and full picture of their character from being obtained. Moreover, the regime had established such an all-pervasive network and structure of suppression and such working conditions for embassies and the media that little came to the surface. Nevertheless, even in these conditions our embassy did provide objective information on the situation in the country. But I believe it was difficult to forecast with absolute accuracy such a—torrential, explosive—development of Romanian events. It is clear from statements by some leaders of the National Salvation Front that they found it difficult too.

During the 17-19 December period we gradually accumulated information on the suppression of the demonstration in Timisoara and on the actions in a number of other cities where we did not have representatives and to which access was closed. It was very confusing. The Romanian authorities not only gave no information in response to our requests, but pretended that nothing was happening.

They closed the border with neighboring states, including to Soviet tourists, blaming bad weather conditions, although the weather was excellent.

On 19 December, in Brussels answering journalists' questions on my attitude to the events in Romania, I said that if there had been casualties there it was of course profoundly to be regretted.

Incidentally, Ceausescu was extremely irritated when he heard this statement, which was nothing less than a condemnation of the violence in a "diplomatic" form.

But a verbal statement in conventional form is one thing and a statement by the USSR's supreme organ of state power on events in a neighboring country is another.

That is why, as soon as it received reliable confirmation of the true scale of the uprising and of the casualties, the Congress adopted a statement and then sent a message to the Romanian people.

Did we foresee the events in Romania? I can state quite frankly that we had no illusions about the nature of the Ceausescu regime and its "popularity." It was clear that a highly cultivated and civilized people did not accept such methods of government. Our embassy's information on that score, I repeat, was entirely objective and accurate.

There was no doubt that tension was growing in Romania, that the "political boiler" might explode, that it could not go on like that any more. But no one could have predicted the date when this would occur or what form it would take. The people's action was spontaneous and no one engineered it.

On the eve of it, at the critical moment, our embassy in Bucharest did all it could to provide Moscow with prompt and high-quality information. Soviet diplomats displayed considerable personal courage. In fact, they often had literally to brave bullets to obtain first-hand information.

Let me tell you also that, as ever in extreme situations, the USSR Foreign Ministry was in practically round-the-clock "two-way contact" with the embassy. Ambassador Ye.M. Tyazhelnikov, who had been on leave, left immediately for Bucharest.

Within a very short time the embassy had organized the reception and delivery of aid from the USSR to the Romanian people. Approximately R700,000 worth of medical supplies alone reached Romania just in the last few days of December.

Now that the situation is gradually normalizing, our embassy is confronted with the major task of organizing the most effective possible cooperation with Romania in this difficult and crucial period for the country.

I hope that what I have said does not create the impression that the Foreign Ministry takes an uncritical approach to the work of our missions abroad. We can see problems there, and substantial problems at that. We will be discussing them on a broad and fundamental plane in a few weeks' time at a special conference on the embassies' work, and we are making careful preparations for that.

To conclude, something further.

Some of the responses to events in Romania and other East European countries have betrayed echoes of the ideas of olden times, when it was thought in order to "explain" to our friends what best suited their interests. Convinced by bitter experience that not all fields can be sown with corn, we have resolutely renounced such practice. Sometimes we even have to hold back some of our representatives who are too "enterprising."

We have made our choice. It is perestroyka. It has opened up new horizons for—it would be no exaggeration to say—all of mankind. At the same time we are not trying to impose our approaches on anyone else. Every people is at liberty to determine for itself how to use the chance that history gives it.

The country's political leadership is orienting our diplomacy toward frank and respectful dialogue with allies and partners, toward a joint quest for a balance of interests on the path to giving our relations new qualities in accordance with the high ideals of democracy and freedom. I believe that in this sense our visit to Romania, on the eve of which I am writing these lines, will be no exception.

Respectfully yours,
E. Shevardnadze.

Romania's Brucan Cited on Shevardnadze Visit

PM0501110190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Romanian National Salvation Front News Conference"]

[Text] Bucharest, 4 Jan—We attach tremendous significance to the upcoming visit to Romania by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. The Soviet Union's leadership will be briefed on the processes taking place in Romania. S. Brucan, member of the National Salvation Front Council Executive Bureau, stated this today at a news conference for Romanian and foreign journalists.

Romania's National Salvation Front is not and never will be a political party. However, in the upcoming elections in April the National Salvation Front will use all its political influence in the struggle against its political opponents, he emphasized. In my view, the Communist Party in Romania has come to the end of its existence, Brucan continued. This does not mean, however, that its members cannot meet, convene an extraordinary congress, seek a new name and program, and participate in elections.

Answering a question from a Western correspondent, Brucan pointed out that the "Bessarabian question" does not exist for the National Salvation Front. In addition, he reminded him, the said territory bears the name of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic. As for relations between the inhabitants of Romania and Soviet Moldavia, we hope that contacts between them will be far more intensive in the very near future.

Romanian Life Said Returning to Normal

PM0401140390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Jan 90 Second Edition p3

[APN own correspondent V. Samoshkin report for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Bidding Farewell to Gloomy Symbols"]

[Text] Bucharest—In the last few days, hardly any shots have been heard in Bucharest at night. The National Salvation Front Council has called for national reconciliation and an end to all terrorist acts, including "against Communists and other elements of the old regime." "The establishment of democracy, freedom, and dignity," the appeal says, "which are the excellent objectives of our revolution, can only be achieved by peaceful means, in an atmosphere of reconciliation between all forces in our society."

The military tribunals set up across the country have certainly contributed to the cease-fire. By the set time—1700 hours on 28 December—many terrorists had laid down their arms and surrendered to the authorities: The death penalty will be replaced by prison sentences of various lengths as far as they are concerned. But those fanatics who are continuing to offer resistance face summary trial and harsh reprisals under military law.

All the signs are that life is getting back to normal. The government is taking shape and 11 ministers have already been appointed: They are all competent, fairly young people. Commissions responsible for tackling various problems—the economy, legislation, youth, education, foreign policy, and so forth—have been set up under the highest body of state authority, namely, the National Salvation Front Council, until democratic elections are held in April. The first thing that the new bodies of state authority have to do is ascertain the real state of affairs in various spheres of life. Primarily in the economy. The main thing that they have managed to establish so far is that Romania's national economy is undergoing a profound, acute crisis.

Another point. The first thing that the National Salvation Front Council commission for agricultural problems has come up against is the shocking picture of overreporting and falsification of the true state of affairs in this sector. Ceausescu's triumphantly pompous reports on agricultural output have in reality proved to be total fakes and nothing more than window-dressing. For example, the fantastic figure for this year's grain production which astounded everyone—60 million tonnes—was in fact exaggerated more than three-fold in comparison to the real harvest yield. The output indicators for other agricultural crops were 2-6 times higher than the real figures. And if you consider that a large proportion of what was actually produced was used for export, you can understand why hunger, coupled with cold and darkness in cities and apartments, were the gloomy symbols of "Ceausescu's golden era."

Even the first measures taken by the new government have noticeably changed the situation on the consumer market. As a result of abolishing the export of agricultural produce, consignments of food ready for dispatch abroad have been pouring into the stores.

It has become lighter in Romanian apartments. The "diabolical tariff system," to quote one newspaper, has been abolished and a uniform price for one kilowatt of electricity introduced: 65 bani (in the past, people had to pay 4 times more per kilowatt if they exceeded the tariffs).

Against the background of these appreciable improvements in the everyday lives of the working people, the results of a public opinion poll conducted by the center for the study of youth problems are significant. To the question: "Do you think that in the future everyone will begin to work better?" 97 percent of the respondents replied in the affirmative.

The sharp democratization of social life can be felt in everything: in radio and television broadcasts, in the new publications, and in the new image and language of the Romanian press. New political parties are rapidly forming, such as the Social Democratic Party and the Democratic Party, the National Peasants Party (banned in 1948) is being revived, a politically independent League of Students is in the process of registering, and an ecological movement has formed. Only the Communist Party has yet to show signs of life, although it has not been formally banned by anyone. Its future is unclear. The concepts of "socialism," "communism," and "communist party" are now identified in people's minds with Ceausescu and his bloody repressions and spiritual enslavement of the nation. This is certainly understandable. But there are also a considerable number of honest people in the Communist Party who did nothing to stain their reputations during the years of the dictator's regime. On the contrary, there are quite a lot of Communists who did not accept Ceausescu's policies. Particularly dramatic is the position of those older Communists who struggled against the Stalinism of Gheorghiu-Dej and spent time in jail because of this, and then, under Ceausescu, found themselves taking a back seat in politics. Even if healthy forces in the Communist Party unite and get themselves organized, they will still find it difficult to gain the support of the electorate in the April elections.

The program platform of the National Salvation Front Council is so radical that it sweeps away in one stroke questions which other socialist countries embarking on a path of renewal have been studying for months and years. Judging by the program of the National Salvation Front Council and some statements by its leaders, Romania is going to move along the path of democracy toward a convergent society that will combine the best features of socialism and capitalism.

What will be the fate of the National Salvation Front Council after the elections? This also remains unclear at present. That is why the front's leaders intend to turn to other countries for advice.

At North Station, where I was seeing off a group of journalists going to Moscow, I fell into conversation with a young man called Mircea Stanculescu while waiting for the train. He works as a junior engineer at a furniture factory in Constanta Judet and was travelling home to his family in Cluj for the holiday.

"In the last years of the Ceausescu regime," he said, "the atmosphere was simply stifling. We felt that the situation could not go on like this, that something would happen. When everything did happen, I could not believe it. It was an emotional shock. My parents wept with joy and my friends too. What a vast distance separates us from what was! And what a distance we have yet to travel! We must be patient and everything will be fine."

Necessary Romanian Agrarian Reforms Outlined

PM0401155190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Volodin, M. Krushinskiy dispatch: "Romania: Well-Fed and Warm for the First Time"]

[Text] Bucharest—Romania is casting off a colossal burden. For 3 days beginning 31 December only transport and industrial enterprises where production simply cannot be stopped were functioning. Romania has entered the new year with a sense of joy and liberation from tyrannical oppression that cannot be communicated.

At the moment the country is paying tribute to those who died. There are many thousands of them, although the original figure of 60,000, has, fortunately, proved to be greatly exaggerated. For the first time in recent decades, Romanians were able to watch church services on television, and, as was the custom of their forebears, to sprinkle wine on the floor in memory of the dead, without hiding from neighbors or making a secret of their tears.

Documentary features of street clashes filmed by cameramen from the "Alexandru Stakhiya" Studio, can still be glimpsed on television screens, but peace and calm are already knocking on Romanians' doors. Alas, this urgent call has not yet reached everybody. On the night of the New Year, sporadic shooting could still be heard in various parts of Bucharest. Straggling pedestrians still keep glancing anxiously at roof tops and attic windows. Nonetheless, with every passing day life is increasingly returning to normal.

The most odious laws of the toppled regime, including the barbaric ban on communications between Romanian citizens and foreigners, have been abolished as being at variance with the principles of humanism and democracy. The first legislative enactments adopted by the provisional government open up broad possibilities for acquiring dual citizenship, thus considerably facilitating the return to Romania of thousands of people who left the country illegally during the years of the inhuman dictatorship.

It was snowing during the first days of the new year in Romania, but no one is freezing in their homes. The free Romanian television has reported that supplies of gas and electricity have increased by 40-45 percent in comparison with December 1988. At festive tables on which a lot of food from the closed-down special distribution centers for the elite has appeared, Romanians, shuddering, recalled the unheated apartments of the "golden age." For the first time in many years there are oranges, a forgotten luxury, for children.

Many things are happening in Romania for the first time this year. The country is emerging from international isolation. Romanians are fearlessly expressing their ideas and opinions without shying away from foreign journalists with whom Bucharest is teeming. Romania is beginning to learn the truth about itself not from the broadcasts of foreign radio stations, but from the government itself which seeks an open dialogue with the people. An hour before the beginning of the New Year it was announced that the execution of the pair of tyrants was the last such punishment carried out in the country. By decision of the National Salvation Front council, capital punishment has been abolished.

The New Year holiday was a brief respite. The country will have to work, sparing no effort to overcome the profound crisis engendered by the system of lies and violence. The planned transformations in the economy apply above all to the agrarian sector. The horrific "systematization" plan in accordance with which some 6,000-7,000 of so-called "unpromising" villages were to have been liquidated has been consigned to the archives. In the multistory "Ceausescu villages" which were to take their place, with their symbolic fenced-in front gardens, it would have been easy to keep an eye on the peasantry.

One of the first steps taken by the new leadership to resolve the food problem is the cancellation of food exports. However, the decisive changes must, understandably, come in the sphere of production rather than distribution. Land to the peasants! This slogan, tried and tested in the flames of many revolutions, has also been included in the government program of radical transformations planned in Romania. Land suitable for tilling will be handed over for long-term use to members of agricultural cooperatives and other citizens who have expressed the desire to work the land in exchange of a certain amount of tax to be paid into the state coffers. Hiring labor will not be permitted. The maximum size of plots of land made available for private use will depend on the quality of the soil and the nature of the terrain. It may be as much as 5,000 square meters; in areas of established collectivization the introduction of the right

to inherit peasant farmsteads together with the plots of land on which the house and farm buildings are located is envisioned.

Citizens, obtaining land, will be able to use mechanized tilling services on the basis of payments in money or kind. The supply of seeds, seedlings, fertilizer, feed, and so forth will also be centralized. It will be possible to sell the agricultural produce obtained on this land either at free prices on the market or under contract to specialized enterprises.

The Romanian revolution has inherited a burdensome economic legacy. The situation is made worse by the unscrupulous lies of the statistical authorities, which to the very end were concerned only with embellishing, with "glossing over" the true state of affairs and hiding the truth, at least from people abroad. A coupon system, nonavailability of the most essential goods, hours-long waiting lines for meat and dairy products...

Essentially, with every passing year the country sank deeper and deeper into the mire of an acute food crisis. Therefore it is no accident that the consumer, agrarian sector of the economy is at the focus of the reforms. It is necessary, first of all, to enable people to feed themselves and their compatriots! In our opinion, the new leadership is quite right in thinking that only after this has been done, will it be possible to speak in earnest about democratization in the various spheres of life.

Albanian Leader Cited on Reform, Economy

PM0301130790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[From the TASS, REUTER, and UPI roundup under the "Abroad" rubric: "New Year's Message"]

[Text] Albanian leader Alia said the following in a New Year message: "Recent events in Eastern Europe have inspired some well-known anti-Albanian forces to resume the slander campaign against our country. However, they will not be successful, since we will never allow anyone to foist their laws and norms on us." Alia warned at the same time that "very strict economy measures will have to be adopted everywhere" next year.

Bulgarian Roundtable Discussion Moving Ahead

PM0501124990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Practical Step Toward Roundtable Consultations"]

[Text] Sofia, 4 Jan—The first practical step has been taken toward roundtable consultations between representatives of the ruling parties—the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] and the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union (BZNS)—and nonparty deputies of the Bulgarian National Assembly on the one hand and the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) on the other. A discussion of procedural questions relating to the upcoming consultations began in the National Assembly building Wednesday [3 January].

As BCP Central Committee press spokesman I. Angelov stated at the end of the first exchange of opinions, the ruling forces' delegation proposed to their partners in the talks that working groups be set up on questions of the political reform, the economy or socioeconomic policy, and the legal system. However, he pointed out, the SDS prefers to focus attention mainly on the political system, even though some representatives of its delegation understood the need to discuss economic problems, too.

On the eve of the opening of the discussions the Bulgarian press published an SDS statement which set out the union's platform at the talks. The SDS advocates in particular the "elimination of the single-party monopoly" of power (meaning the BCP), the disbandment of primary party organizations in the workplace, and the "depoliticization of the army, the militia, the courts, and the procuracy." The Union is striving for "real guarantees for the operation of a multiparty system in the country."

CSSR President Havel Visits Berlin, Holds Talks

PM0401131990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch: "GDR-CSSR: First Visit to Berlin"]

[Text] Berlin—At the invitation of Manfred Gerlach, acting chairman of the GDR State Council, President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia paid a visit to Berlin on Tuesday. The president's first foreign visit lasted a few hours. Talks took place between the two countries' heads of government and ministers of foreign affairs.

A statement for the press notes that in the opinion of the two sides, the process of democratic reforms in the GDR and the CSSR expands and strengthens their cooperation. Proceeding from their responsibility for the preservation of peace and strengthening of security, both states intend to contribute to building the common European home in which people will live in conditions of freedom, trusting each other. Security and cooperation must be based on the principle in accordance with which the stability of the European borders provides a guarantee for mutual trust. M. Gerlach and V. Havel expressed support for the proposal to hold a summit meeting of Helsinki process participant states this year.

The Czechoslovak president visited the memorial to the victims of militarism and fascism on Under-den-Linden and the Brandenburg Gate. Subsequently the two countries' leaders gave a press conference.

V. Havel said that his visit to the GDR, originally conceived as a purely symbolic gesture, had turned into a working visit. This, according to his words, is in keeping with the accelerating pace of the development of

events. One of the main reasons for his current visit is the fact that Czechoslovakia shares a relatively long border with both German States. Europe, he said, must consist of free, independent states. V. Havel briefed journalists on his meeting with representatives of the "roundtable" of GDR parties and public movements. He invited them to visit Prague in February to meet representatives of Civic Forum, Charter-77, and the movement "Public Against Violence."

Answering journalists' questions, M. Gerlach said that the planned treaty-based community of the German states goes far beyond the framework of the provisions of the Treaty on the Basic Guidelines for Relations between the GDR and the FRG. Confederative structures may arise in the process. He admitted that "in that case the two German states might end up under one roof."

In this context V. Havel stated that in his opinion "the solution of the problems of Europe and of Germany represents two sides of the same medal. The elimination of the wall dividing Europe is difficult to imagine without the elimination of the wall dividing Germany, and vice versa." He said that he hoped that the path toward a confederation of German states would be embarked upon soon. However, he stressed, their neighbors must be freed from possible fears about the emergence of a "greater Germany."

On the same day President V. Havel and his party left by air for Munich for talks with FRG leaders.

Havel Says CSSR To Fulfill Pact Commitments

LD0201171990 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] Prague January 2 TASS—Czechoslovakia links its defence capability with the development of world and European processes leading to the reduction of arms and disarmament.

"We abide by the commitments stemming from Czechoslovakia's membership in the Warsaw Treaty organisation," says President Vaclav Havel's order, published today.

The order was released in connection with Havel's appointment as commander-in-chief of the national armed forces in keeping with the constitution.

The president called for inculcating in the servicemen of the Czechoslovak People's Army the spirit of democracy, humanism and patriotism.

Adamec Cited on CPCZ Future Activity

PM0401133390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Before the CPCZ Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Prague, 3 Jan—The Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] program is a program for the renewal of socialism with complete respect for the Czechoslovak people's convictions and democratic, humanist, and cultural traditions, L. Adamec, chairman of the CPCZ, writes today in RUDE PRAVO. The party must draw the correct conclusions from the prevailing situation and rid itself of past mistakes.

The strengthening and maintenance of the competence of the party which has been set up again on truly democratic principles is a question of vital importance. Despite our extremely severe assessment of our own actions and despite all the former leadership's mistakes, we have no cause to renounce the noble ideals of social justice and social progress.

The CPCZ Central Committee plenum scheduled for 6 January is to be a resolute step in the development and implementation of the principles in the CPCZ action program. We must elaborate our stance on the question of future party building, the creation of a new apparatus, and the activity of primary party organizations, and discuss Communists' tasks within the framework of the social system as a whole. Within a very short period of time we must elaborate the CPCZ attitude to government policy in the socioeconomic sphere. We will act not as opponents but as one of the forces involved in developing this policy.

There is no time to lose. Preparations for free elections are beginning. That is why it is necessary to ensure that party policy is open to the population.

Czechoslovak Leaders, Changes Pondered

PM0401115190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 89 pp 2-3

[Special correspondent A. Kuprianov article: "Prague Fall"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Is there a revolution in Prague? The speed with which events have developed is stunning.

I am on my way to the Secretariat to meet Vasil Mohorita, member of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee Presidium (Footnote) (V. Mohorita has been elected first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee at the Communists' extraordinary congress)—I have been promised an audience. An hour passes, and another... "Sorry, the meeting will not take place today. We will call you. What is happening?.. The Presidium is expelling former General Secretary Milos Jakes and former First Secretary of the Prague City Committee Miroslav Stepan from the party."

Their names are linked with the student demonstration of 17 November when the order went out to use police nightsticks.... The political blindness of the people who issued this order was criminal!

Fifty years ago on the same day the Gestapo had killed the Prague medical student Jan Opletal. And half a

century later, on the day devoted to the memory of the victims of fascism, blood again flowed in the streets....

Inappropriate historical parallels? Does not the root of all violence lie in intoxication with power developing into total license?

I drive to the spot where the tragedy occurred. There is a crowd of people, candles are burning. They are being lit near the column and near the walls of buildings, in places where traces of blood have been discovered. And flowers, fresh flowers, which must not be trampled underfoot.

Shooting in Ulster, assault troops in Panama, blood flowing in Romania and Prague, nightsticks and shovels in Tbilisi... When at last will we who have for decades claimed a vanguard role in the development of civilization stop killing each other?

At the student strike headquarters I hear: According to official information no one has been killed. There are injured. And there are people who have been missing without trace since 17 November. A government commission is investigating....

The 17 November student demonstration triggered events in Czechoslovakia which have been dubbed here the "gentle," "velvet" revolution. The slogan put forward by Vaclav Havel, the Civic Forum leader—"Truth and love will conquer lies and hatred"—has met with understanding both among the people and in the government.

The students won the support of the workers and the creative intelligentsia. For instance, in order to organize a public address system in Wenceslas Square, musicians have given up all their equipment—amplifiers, microphones, cables. Hundreds of posters, leaflets, and handwritten commentaries are being manufactured. The whole of Wenceslas Square has been transformed into a people's newspaper. Free from censorship. There are portraits of T. Masaryk, the republic's first president, of the legendary Alexander Dubcek, and the present leader of the people and recent political prisoner Vaclav Havel...

The amazing thing is that there is not a single leaflet to be seen from the Czech Communists. And yet the party, unlike the students with their marker pens and Civic Forum with its copiers, has whole publishing houses, printing plants, and newspapers at its disposal... In a television interview Vasil Mohorita remarked sarcastically: "The committees are probably waiting for instructions from 'above' as to what the slogan of the moment should be."

The Czechoslovak Socialist Youth Union, at that time still headed by V. Mohorita, supported the student movement. Vasil himself was the only ranking leader who joined the people in the square. This is what he said at the time: "I know that people are saying about me: 'Mohorita, feed at our trough!" Naturally, I find this insulting. However, we must forget about personal insults today. Like you all, I am thinking about the new Czechoslovakia..." He was rewarded with applause.

It is an old truth: If the people mock the thirst for power and identify power itself with a feed trough, the only way to rehabilitate oneself is to go to the people.

In a window I read: "Poland—10 years. Hungary—10 months. Czechoslovakia—10 days."

One day, historians will painstakingly analyze piece by piece this incredible pile of events and elaborate accurate political assessments of the 10 days which shook the republic. I am only trying to give a thumbnail sketch of the Prague fall of 1989. My opinion may be subjective, but that is understandable: I too was drawn into the vortex of changes for which I, like everyone, had been waiting for a long time.

Revolution Tomorrow!

Valtr Komarek, 59 years of age, first deputy premier of the CSSR Government. In 1968 he worked as general secretary of the economic council. He was removed from his post.

Jan Carnogursky, 46 years of age, first deputy premier. A lawyer by profession. Worked as a driver. Ten days ago he was released from the dock of a political trial.

Jiri Dienstbier, 52 years of age, Czechoslovak foreign minister. A journalist in the past who has visited many of the world's countries. After 1968 he worked as a janitor and a stoker. Known throughout the country as a rights champion.

Petr Miller, 45 years of age, minister of labor and social affairs. Worked as a blacksmith.

Tomorrow they will be the government.

Tomorrow the former smith Petr Miller will expound his views on how the country's new economic mechanism should function. (What times we live in! How can a smith become a minister?!) Is this conceivable?.. It is December, only a month to go to the beginning of the new year!.. "It is," Miller says. "It is necessary to pass new laws on banks and taxes, on budget levies and foreign currency."

And the Federal Assembly will pass these laws.

As for today... It is the middle of the night, and in the seething cauldron of the Civic Forum I put three questions to the smith:

"If you become minister, what will the main principle of your work be?"

"Never to place myself above the people."

"What is your main concern for the future?"

"To prevent economic chaos."

"Are you happy?"

"Yes, if it is possible to use this word to describe my present state. I have not been home for days. I have my hobbies, a yacht which I have built with my own hands, two beautiful dogs. If I become minister, I will have to forget about all this for a long time..."

Tomorrow Czechoslovak newspapers will feature the photograph of the government's first reception devoted to its inauguration. And Jan Carnogursky, the former disgraced lawyer from Bratislava, smart and elegant, with gleaming spectacles, will graciously raise a glass of champagne to toast the government. And it is possible that among the people who will raise their glasses in response there will be some who only yesterday issued instructions to "open the case against Carnogursky." Now he, responsible for the observance of legality in the country, will have to work with them, communicate with them, issue instructions, listen to their advice and suggestions... But that will be tomorrow.

And today, today there is another round of consultations about the composition of the new government. I manage to catch Jan Carnogursky by the door to the plenum and to ask him a "ticklish" question:

"What will happen to those who were engaged in practical implementation of the administrative-edict system methods?"

"We are embarking on building a rule-of-law state. In these circumstances there is and can be no room for the settling of personal scores and ambitions, or to put it more simply, for revenge. In my opinion it is not desirable to retain the repressive sections of the former apparatus in the future. As for the economic apparatus, it will have to undergo a profound reform. This apparatus, when it is reorganized and cut back, will begin to work with its brain, rather than its brawn, as has been the case in the past..."

Tomorrow Jiri Dienstbier, a tall, gray man, replying to Western correspondents' questions, will say at his first news conference as minister of foreign affairs: "Czechoslovakia favors the abolition of military blocs in Europe. However, this a two-way process. The CSSR will remain a member of the Warsaw Pact. I see no reason for withdrawing from CEMA."

But today, today Dienstbier is giving a different news conference in his capacity as leader of Civic Forum. And in the hall crammed with reporters, a question rings out which has the effect of a bombshell... No, there is nothing unusual about the content of this question. It is simply that after all these days and nights in the Civic Forum press hall, a question is put in Russian:

"Are there any links between Civic Forum and the people's fronts and movements in the USSR? Are you aware of Soviet people's support?"

"We received a warm letter from Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov..."

At the end of this news conference there will be the announcement of the rehabilitation of "Prague Spring."

Later that night I talked to Academician Sakharov on the telephone. No, I did not make a person-to-person call from Prague to Moscow. It is just that a colleague on a Czechoslovak newspaper asked me to get a rerun of a telephone interview with the academician—the line was very bad, individual words were unintelligible....

I introduce myself, try to explain my mission, my words come out in a jumble out of emotion and the pressure of events. Andrey Dmitriyevich interrupts me:

"There is little time. I'll dictate..."

Yes, he had very little time left, only a few days. And it was not interference alone which was to blame for the poor sound quality of the interview. Sakharov began: "I am happy and excited, I congratulate our peoples...."

Tomorrow a gleaming black limousine will set out to fetch First Deputy Premier Valtr Komarek, a smart young man in a nice coat will leap out and hold the door open...

But Komarek will say apologetically to the young man: "I have two journalists with me, I promised them an interview on my first day in office, and we will not fit into the limousine." And he will invite the reporters into his old "Zhiguli" whose right-hand doorhandle comes off if the door is slammed hard.

And an amazing tour of Prague begins. The deputy premier makes a round of ministries and departments—accepting ministers' resignations, thanking them for their work, asking them to hand over with dignity and speed. And every time in the spacious and well furnished reception rooms he drops a subtle hint to the smiling secretaries: "I have some journalists with me. They never have time to have breakfast...."

And Volodya Blazek, a radio reporter from Munich, sipping his coffee tells me quietly: "You know, Sasha, in 1969 I was chased out of these reception rooms...."

Tomorrow all this will happen, tomorrow. Meanwhile, today, I literally grab Valtr Komarek by the lapel in the crush:

"Tell me, what do you dislike most?"

"Formalism in relations," he replies glancing at his lapel and laughing infectiously. People are saying that he will get into the government thanks to his personal popularity and charisma....

Tomorrow...all this will happen tomorrow.

Our hearts are heavy with the presentiment of changes, tragedies, and happiness which are in store for us in the future.

But the desire for revolution cannot be postponed for "later." I felt that that night before they became the government.

Two Interviews With the Presidential Candidate

Vaclav Havel, 53 years of age, playwright. Persecuted by the authorities for his activities in "Charter-77." Subjected to imprisonment at various times. None of his plays has been staged in the Soviet Union. Leader of Civic Forum.

He is pacing up and down in the hall, surrounded by secretaries and staff. Catching my eye, he stops and shrugs his shoulders...

"So he got my note," I think to myself. And I guess: "His time is no longer his own."

A moment's lull is enough for the journalists to switch on their microphones:

"Mr Havel, will there be capitalism or socialism in Czechoslovakia?"

"Mr Havel, are you a playwright or a politician?"

Simon Panek, the Prague student leader, pushes his way through the crowd:

"Vaclav, this is the Soviet correspondent I told you about..."

"I know," Havel says and, resolutely brushing aside the microphones, he makes for the stairs.

"I have forgotten all my Russian," says Havel, "I knew you were here."

We greet each other in Czech: "Ahoy!"

"How much time do you need for the interview," Havel asks.

"Forty-five minutes," I reply.

"What?! Forty-five minutes?!"—cry the secretaries and staff. "Mr Havel hasn't even got 5 minutes to drink a cup of coffee!"

One of them, unshaven, with a kind of a pigtail at the back of his head, in a baggy sweater down to his knees, is particularly outraged.

"Ten, a maximum of 10 minutes!"—he insists, gesturing with his fingers.

"Okay then, 25 minutes!" I say, refusing to give in.

"Ten!" the disheveled person shouts, trying to make himself heard above the waves of noise flooding in from the Civic Forum's corridors, where passions are seething at this late hour—only the night remains before the appointment of the new government. Moving through the clouds of cigarette smoke, tireless striking students are serving free sandwiches and coffee. They smile and when someone tries to slip them a few crowns, they just say: "It is communism here..."

For a moment I am struck by the unreality of what is happening. A disgraced playwright with eyes red from lack of sleep. Yesterday he sat in prison, today he is president-elect... The windows of stores full of meat, sausage, and goods and of apartment blocks are plastered with slogans. And finally, two singers, one officially recognized, the "golden voice" of the country, the other a bard who returned from exile yesterday, both of them beloved of the people—Karel Gott and Karel Kryl—arms around each other's shoulders in front of the microphone, give an inspired rendering of the national anthem at the end of a rally of many thousands of people in Wenceslas Square...

This is Prague at night, where it seems eternity has lost its way in the alleyways and where on a dank day there is always a glass of grog for you in the many wine bars and pubs...

"We are right here!" Wenceslas Square explodes with thousands of workers' voices. "We are no longer afraid!" thousands of students' voices respond from the Manege...

"Okay, 15 minutes," Havel interrupts our haggling, "I'll expect you Monday."

He disappears just as suddenly as he appeared. The whole conversation lasted no longer than a couple of minutes. And only someone shouting after him: "Mr Havel, what is your attitude toward the Soviet Union?" confirms that what is happening is real....

For a short time your correspondent becomes a small sensation among the journalistic fraternity. I am bombarded with questions: "Do you know Havel?"

And one sharp-tongued lady radio correspondent (she emigrated from the Soviet Union "at the height of perestroyka," by her own admission, and is now working for the BBC, it appears) said in a tetchy voice in my direction: "All this is just flirting with Russian Communists. You will never get your interview...."

Two years ago, on a fall night like this one, I sat with Vaclav Havel in a room with unusually light, almost white furniture. We spoke about... perestroyka in the Soviet Union! Naturally, it had not been easy for us to meet. The first interview between a Czechoslovak dissident and a Soviet journalist in 20 years. It is true, very quickly I changed from interviewer to interviewee. Havel wanted to know about everything—about the economic reform, about the possibility of the emergence of another party, workers' support for the new policy, the cooperative movement. And even about the Soviet people's attitude to the appearance on television screens of the wife of the general secretary. "You must understand," Havel sought to persuade me, "that this is normal, it is a sign of civilization...." We spoke about grain imports, about the waiting lines, about the

returning Soviet artistic avant-garde, about the motley crowd of young people on the Moscow Arbat....

"He is a greater champion of perestroyka than I am," I wrote down in my notebook in the early hours.

Some time later, in the course of detailed discussions which I do not want to go into today, high-ranking people tried to convince me that Vac'av Havel was, in fact, an inveterate opponent of the Soviet Union. That he was advocating a restoration of capitalism because he comes from a bourgeois family, and that moreover he was a drunk and a drug addict. "Maybe you simply do not know Havel," I retorted timidly. "We know him well," they replied. Imagine my surprise when 2 years later, within the same prestigious walls, I was asked to help "organize contacts with the representatives of the opposition on neutral territory." That is how they referred to the "representatives of the opposition," unable to grasp that Civic Forum, swept in on a wave of public protests, had in a matter of days become not the opposition, but the mouthpiece of the will of the people. Czechoslovak Communists are faced with a difficult situation: There is a mass exodus from the party, confusion reigns in committees. What the CPCZ needs is consolidation.

Does not the task of diplomats abroad include reporting "higher up" the brazenness of certain journalists meeting with "undesirable" elements? But what is one to do if yesterday's "undesirables" are marked out as presidential candidates today....

My first encounter with Vaclav Havel ended, as I mentioned earlier, in the early hours. He did not ask me whether I would write anything about the interview, fully aware of the delicacy of the situation. He only asked: "Can I tell foreign radio stations that I met with a Soviet journalist?" I told him firmly: "It is your right." But Vaclav only spoke about our encounter after I had reported it (SOBESEDNIK No. 6, 1988). This sort of decency cannot but be appreciated.

As for the profile in SOBESEDNIK.... There are no brave journalists, only brave chief editors. Only a few lines were published about Havel. I described him as a champion of spreading democracy and expressed my patent approval of the fact that "in a difficult year for Czechoslovakia, and at a time which was difficult for him personally, he did not quit his homeland...."

It is inept to cite oneself. I am doing so for only one reason. It is because I would put my name to these lines again today. I believe that on this occasion they will no longer cause irritation or anger either among the staff of the Czechoslovak Embassy in the USSR or the Soviet Embassy in Czechoslovakia.

As we parted, Havel presented me with a book of his with a brief dedicatory inscription. I took off my watch. It was a simple R25 "Slava."

"Many people are synchronizing their watches with Moscow now. Perestroyka is a revolution...."

I had the impression that a sad smile fleeted across his face.

And so, 2 years on, the promised Monday arrives. Together with an old friend, Czechoslovak writer and journalist Jaromir Stetina, we switch on 2 tape recorders. We are making a double recording, fully aware of the importance of the moment: The leader of the new Czechoslovak sociopolitical formation and presidential candidate is giving his first interview for the Soviet press. It will be published the following day (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 December). I will reiterate the main points: Havel expressed himself in favor of democracy and pluralism, love of peace and cooperation, and equitable political partnership with the Communist Party, among others.

The interview ends. Vaclav lights a cigarette and leans back. He looks like a man at the limit of his physical capabilities. It is difficult to be ebullient in a revolution. Even if it is a peaceful revolution.

"How are things in the Soviet Union? How is perestroyka progressing?.."

The secretary, who has been timing our interview literally by the minute, points excitedly to the dial of his watch.

"Time!"—I repeat the secretary's gesture. But with a concealed hint. Havel understands:

"The watch is at home, in my study. I do not wear it. It is a souvenir."

His eyes narrow, it is as if he recalls something and want to add something, but then he just hides a smile in his red mustache.

It seems to me that he wanted to say: "You know, I think the time has come to synchronize watches with Prague time too..."

But it is a hopeless task to try to guess what politicians are thinking.

He puts on his scarf and jacket and walks out of the "Avrora" building (this is the name of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Center which has been assigned to Civic Forum as its office by the mayor of Prague).

Has he walked out to take on the job of President? [passage omitted]

GDR Neofascism Not Simply Result of Change

LD0401215890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Konstantin Patsyuk commentary]

[Excerpt] In recent days, neofascist elements have been active in Berlin, Rostock, Gera and elsewhere. At the microphone is Konstantin Patsyuk with an up-to-date commentary.

[Patsyuk] At turning points in the history of any country things may happen that would be simply unthinkable in normal times. This is probably what can be seen in the GDR now that it has taken the path of change. However, this is not, I think, the only cause of the neo-Nazi incidents that have been increasingly prevalent in the republic recently. Yes, they may have exploited the instability in the country, and the sharp turn in the direction toward democratization and openness that has occurred there, but is that the only thing that has thrown them up onto the crest of the political wave, and enabled them to become so impudent that they have begun to make open threats of reprisals against foreigners, communists and antifascists, to cause disorder on city streets, desecrate monuments to Soviet antifascist soldiers, and even demand participation in parliamentary elections? I think the cause must also be looked for elsewhere.

For many years, the GDR media steered clear of controversial topics. Now the people have learned that their country faces a threat from the right; that before the end of November last year judicial bodies investigated 144 neofascist cases—three times more than in the previous year; and that the neofascists could not just have suddenly appeared from nowhere. Certainly, even before that, rightwing extremist forces must have existed in the country. To be honest, fascist symbols have never disappeared from the life of that country. [passage omitted]

GDR Opposition Election Alliance Formed

PM0501112190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jan 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Preelection Alliance in GDR"]

[Text] Berlin, 4 Dec—Six GDR opposition parties and political groupings have announced the creation of a preelection alliance with a view to joint participation in the preparation of the parliamentary elections scheduled for 6 May this year.

Konrad Vays, a spokesman for the "Democracy now" organization, told the ADN agency that the preelection alliance has, in addition to the above-mentioned organization, been joined by the Social Democratic Party, the "Democratic Breakthrough" and "New Forum" movements, the "for peace and human rights" action, and the "united leftwingers." An agreement on the formation of this alliance was reached after the fifth "roundtable" meeting.

Hungary's Vastag Addresses Journalists

PM0401141590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting with Journalists']

[Text] The Hungarian Socialist Party's policy aims to preserve and develop friendly ties with the CPSU, Pal Vastag, member of the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] Presidium, who was in our country on a working visit, stated 28 December at a news conference in Moscow.

Having oulined in detail the internal political situation in his country, he spoke about relations between the parties and movements there, about the MSZP's positions in various regions of Hungary, and about the MSZP's preparation for the upcoming parliamentary and presidential elections.

The path of reforms remains unchanged for the MSZP, despite the many difficulites in the process of renewal, the Hungarian guest stressed.

Hungarian Ambassador Arrives in Moscow

PM0501121790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Sandor Gyorke, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, arrived in Moscow 3 January.

Poland To Receive Western Credits From IMF

PM0401133190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Credits for Poland"]

[Text] Warsaw, 2 Jan—The IMF leadership has officially accepted Poland's letter of intent setting out the basic principles and methods for improving the country's economy on the basis of a policy of rigorous economy according with IMF demands. This opens up possibilities for Poland to receive fresh credits from the IMF, and also the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development [IBRD].

In the next few months the IMF will give Poland up to $710 million in order to "support the broad government program to improve the economy." Soon the country will get $250 million in long-term credits granted by the United States in order to finance current imports. Poland will also receive the first payments within the framework of the IMF's long-term stabilization credit amounting to $1 billion, which is to guarantee implementation of the operation to introduce internal convertibility for the Polish zloty. The agreement with the IMF is also to bring into play an entire series of credits and donations to Poland by its Western partners, including IBRD loans amounting to about $300 million. It is also expected that, following the agreement between Poland and the IMF, talks will begin with Western creditors about rescheduling Poland's debt repayments.

Poland still has to check in practice the precise sums of credit received from the West and their effectiveness with regard to settling complex economic problems.

Scientist Analyzes East European Developments

PM0301164190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 90 p 2

[Interview with M.P. Pavlova-Silvanskaya, political scientist and senior associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, by Ye. Kalyadina under the "Point of View" rubric: "A Pit Instead of a Crystal Castle"—place, date of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Changes are snowballing in East Europe.... It is still unclear where they will lead. It is, however, possible to make a judgment on their origins. "We created an artificial scheme of socialism. And we tried to breathe some life in it through administrative edicts. We assured mankind that we were building a crystal castle for it. But we dug a pit"—this is the view of M.P. Pavlova-Silvanskaya, political scientist and senior associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute.

[Kalyadina] Marina Pavlova, I would like to begin our conversation with events which really shook the world last year—the Romanian tragedy. Watching television pictures of delegates to the recent Romanian Communist Party congress enthusiastically applauding their leader [vozhd], it was hard to imagine that the dictatorship would collapse a few days later and the blood of thousands of innocent victims would be shed....

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] You know, for a long time I had the painful premonition that major bloodshed was unavoidable in Romania. But abstract mental exercises are one thing, and the reality of such a slaughter is something quite different. How can anyone escape being shocked?

N. Ceausescu brought totalitarianism to its logical conclusion, to a bloody end. He not only created a masterly system of repressive organs but also—unlike in any other East European country—he crushed and eradicated all opposition to his regime. He is like the Cheshire cat from "Alice in Wonderland": He has already vanished, but his terrifying smile remains. Shots are still exchanged in Romania's cities, and the new structures of power are being created with enormous difficulty—there are no suitable people. Nothing has been prepared or thought out. There are difficulties in breaking the chain of violence: The execution of the criminal couple, atrocities by the palace guard, looting—all these are links of that chain. It will be a long time before the moral wounds are healed.

But there is one thought that pains me most of all. After all, the Securitate gangsters carried party membership cards in their pockets, just like their spiritual father, incidentally. Had such an uprising occurred not in 1989 but before 1985, how would it have been presented to us? Like 1956 in Hungary?

[Kalyadina] The way they were presented by Soviet mass media, events not only in Romania but also in other East European countries erupted like an explosion. What served as detonator?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] Very aptly said: "The way they were presented..." You know, in his essay on A. Platonov, Iosif Brodskiy wrote an amazing phrase to the effect that language could create an illusory world and a nation could become grammatically dependent on it. Today, with East European countries on the move, the solar system modeled by our propaganda is collapsing in the minds of many people who had formed such a dependence. And yet, there had been a pressing need for changes for a long time. The charge had been building up for years, if not decades. It was only a question of when the fuse would be lit.

The detonations occurred under different circumstances, but this is not all that important since the changes were being prompted by identical causes. First and foremost, it has to be said that all East European countries were in a state of crisis for a long time. Like an abscess, it appeared on the surface, coming out into the open. The main difficulty in resistance to totalitarianism lies in overcoming the psychological barrier which separates courageous protest by individuals from the firm expression of will by the ranks of crowds running into thousands. After all, all varieties of authoritarianism and totalitarianism are propped up by fear which divides people. As to when and how the barrier separating the timid "I" from the full dignity of "We" would collapse—this is a social and psychological mystery. The dividing line in East Europe was crossed by the young people, the new generation which does not know and is unwilling to know the fear which paralyzed their elders.

A second and very important fact: It emerged that the "Tiananmen option" would not work in East Europe. The dispersal of demonstrations in Prague and Berlin and the shooting in Timisoara exposed the unpopular policies and the regimes collapsed. True enough, subsequent events in Romanian developed according to an altogether special scenario. As far as Hungary, Poland, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia are concerned, I think that long-established contacts between the opposition played a far from insignificant role. Opposition figures—the ones whom our press castig..ed for extremism—met and elaborated common tactics for a nonviolent coup. It was the use of violence by the authorities in the GDR and Czechoslovakia that served as detonator.

Another factor also had its effect: The East European societies ceased being closed. The information revolution no longer allows official propaganda to cover up the unseemly aspects of life. That which is now happening in this part of the continent reminds me of the familiar

fairground attraction of cars crashing into each other and giving each other the impetus of motion.

Nor should we, of course, forget the so-called "external factor." Perestroyka in the USSR gradually lifted the fear of Soviet tanks. Quite the opposite, people started expecting help from us.

[Kalyadina] In the past, relations between the USSR and East European countries were built like relations between an older brother and his juniors. It was customary to repeat and copy the Soviet leadership's economic and political decisions. Are we not now witnessing an indiscriminate emulation of the USSR?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] What emulation are you talking about... All in all, there is no need to exaggerate the potential of our influence on these states.

One very delicate aspect—moral commitments to former ruling parties—still remains in relations with them. I do not mean responsibility to leaders who banked on the Brezhnev team. Ultimately, everyone is free to choose—some opt for Husaks, others for Havels. With all the ensuing consequences. It is a much more serious matters—responsibility to the parties and their hundreds of thousands of rank and file members. One of the famous Prague Spring figures, speaking of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, said in a fit of anger: "You cannot first break someone's leg and then abandon him at fate's mercy and tell him: 'Off you go, run away!'" This reflection contains an element of down-to-earth truth. But on the other hand, you cannot pretend that Communists would remain at the helm of power like before. The only sensible way out is to distinguish between interstate and interparty relations. Relations between sovereign peoples must be given priority and be raised above the interests of political parties. Consequently, interstate ties must be depoliticized and deideologized.

There is one more change which should in no way be overlooked. A new generation is entering the East European political arena. It is new in two respects: First, these people are strangers to the former corridors of power. Second, they are young, political newcomers. People in the shipyard where L. Walesa used to work, or in the boiler house where Czechoslovakia's present Foreign Minister J. Dienstbier spent many years, think and move differently from people in our own Staraya or Smolenskaya Squares. It is simply out of the question to use language along the following lines with French PEN Club member A. Michnik, who spent 4 years in prison: "A significant place was allocated to different components of the process of changes now under way in East Europe, a process having a profound and highly significant effect on development trends in Europe and the world." Unless our diplomats realize this, a lot of stupid mistakes may be initially committed.

It is also necessary to amend the protocol rules followed by Soviet embassies in East Europe. Whereas missions throughout the civilized world are meant to cover the complete spectrum of political life, ours maintain contacts only with the ruling "team." This is why nothing much is happening now that the sandglass of power has been turned over. The new partners carry quite a few insults in their hearts—they were thoroughly dragged through the mud for a long time.

Here is one of the causes of this predicament: Professional diplomats were rarely appointed in socialist countries, they were mainly retired party officials. They took along to the embassies the oblast party committee morals, the barrack-room and edict attitudes. How can political pluralism be duly honored in these circumstances! After all, many of them overlooked the approaching "landslides": Until the last few hours, some of our embassies were unwilling to believe that the ongoing changes were serious...

[Kalyadina] Marina Pavlovna, let us now turn to the essence of events occurring in East Europe. Is this a crisis of socialism? For example, the word "socialism" is altogether absent from the Czechoslovak "Civic Forum's" program. V. Havel, the movement's leader and current president, said in one of his speeches: "We simply do not know what it means."

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] As if Havel is the only one saying this! For example, Walesa also jokingly remarked that, as far as he was concerned, socialism was where fresh bread could be found. For years on end socialism was presented as a strictly scientific construction, with everything foreseen accurately and in good time. But the construction has suddenly fallen apart. The word itself has been compromised in the eyes of the millions: The last contribution was made by leaders [vozhdi] with billions in Swiss bank accounts, dozens of villas, and orders to shoot at the people.

I do think, however, that the allergy to this word will disappear with the passage of time. This is because socialism, as a noble ethical principle and a system of universal human values—humanism, freedom, democracy, solidarity—cannot become obsolete. The socialist idea and ethics will remain alive in people's minds and hearts as always.

[Kalyadina] Fine, let us assume that the old construction proved precarious. So, is there any likelihood of success in creating a more durable model for the future—genuine socialism?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] This word—"model"—is very dangerous as far the future is concerned. Suppose someone once again embarks on building a rigid model of a glass city (like in Zamyatin's book) for mankind. We have already dug a pit underneath the crystal castle of the future once. Nothing should be imposed on anyone, not even happiness. Let everyone forge it for himself. Of course, a certain amount of prosperity is needed for independence. You know, the Poles have a joke about the three levels of freedom—your own car, your own home, your own opinion.

[Kalyadina] Are events in East European countries not evidence of a crisis of the communist parties' leading role?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] But communist parties in East European countries make no secret of this, they speak openly about it. The crisis has several hypostases. First, in order to overcome the lagging behind, to modernize production, and to solve current problems like defeating inflation and so on, it is necessary now to tighten belts and shut down unprofitable enterprises... Until now, and all over the world, such tasks were resolved by conservative parties, and even if socialist parties did so, they used neoconservative means. The communist parties' ideology does not fit in with them, hence the enormous difficulties, disorder, and at times even splits. The second hypostasis is associated with organizational problems. So-called "new type" parties—with the discipline of democratic centralism which has more centralism than democracy, with the ethics of "Do not think, but listen, and obey!"—proved to be too inflexible. They respond badly to changing circumstances. And finally, the hothouse system of cadre training is useless. Party cadres are taught a dead language and turned into masters of the subtleties of the autokinesis by some categories which are detached from life. Such people prove incapable of conducting a dialogue at critical moments. People in the GDR, for example, quickly learned a practical lesson from this: They abolished the Academy of Social Sciences, the Higher Party School, and the party institutes, and decided that henceforth functionaries should be trained in their time off work, on Sundays.

[Kalyadina] Articles about the communist party's leading role either have been deleted from the constitutions of the countries we are discussing, or will be deleted in the very near future. Does this mean that they have overtaken us in the boldness of political transformations?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] What sort of comparison is this? We are not running some sort of a race. Of course, a sense of timing is very important in politics, but every society has its own historical and political clock, and that is the one according to which things should primarily run.

For as long as the East European communist parties held power firmly in their hands, articles legitimizing this situation were nothing but the icing on the cake. The edifice of the party state could stand even without them. The situation drastically changed following the proclamation of transition to a rule-of-law state: These articles started acquiring a real meaning to the extent that they offered a legal possibility to apply force against those who did not observe the constitutional norm and tried to put other parties (or movements) on an equal footing with the ruling party. Wherever society makes a choice in favor of peaceful evolution and political pluralism, it would be logical to repeal these articles, depoliticize the army and police, and give all political forces equal access to mass media.

E. Krenz was perfectly right when he said in one of his first statements in the GDR that he would accept such decisions insofar as the leading role cannot be decreed. To a certain extent, however, that was a good move in a bad game: When facts of corruption at the very top of the party—so self-assured until so recently—came to light, the people's indignation descended not only upon it but also upon the entire old party-state construction. Society loudly declared "No pasaran!" to violence, and all sorts of articles vanished almost without a trace. Exactly the same thing happened—in very different ways—in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Romania.

The situation in our country is different. The apparatus is holding on more or less firmly everywhere. Part of it will not renounce violence as the ultimate means and therefore will hold on to Article 6.

[Kalyadina] Marina Pavlovna, is a dictatorship of the opposition not likely to replace the dictatorship of communist parties in East Europe?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] Don't forget this: The former opposition, which is now a legitimate political force enjoying the people's support. I think that this is hardly likely to happen. Authoritarian overtones can be detected in speeches by two or three leaders, but this applies primarily to the first genuinely free elections, they are still talking about overthrowing the opponent. This will be followed by a recrystallization of political forces, and there will no room left for dictatorship once a normal political spectrum is fully established.

[Kalyadina] The U.S. newspaper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, analyzing events in East Europe, drew the following conclusion: "Remembering the end of the 'Prague Spring,' we must ask ourselves where the 'Prague Fall' might lead." Is the course of the torrent of change likely to be reversed?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] This question is constantly asked in the West. At the very beginning, the future of East European reforms was indeed very rigidly associated with the irreversibility of our perestroyka. I heard the following deliberation in Hungary on one occasion: "The Soviet Union is a huge ship, we are a tiny boat. As long as your perestroyka remains afloat, we must manage to sail as far away from you as possible—just in case something bad happens to you." The tiny Hungarian boat has been sailing away for over a year now. The Polish one set sail 6 months ago. Others have also set sail now. They are not sailing in parallel with us, some have yet to properly set a course. But voices can still be heard saying: "If perestroyka fails, we'll also be in a mess." But an entire flotilla is already riding the waves. Yes, 20 years ago it was possible to bring tanks into Prague with impunity. Nowadays the supporters of violent methods in politics cannot justify the Tbilisi action even before their own parliament. Coping with the whole of East

Europe has been beyond them for a long time now, and they are perfectly well aware of this.

At this very point I perfectly sincerely wish to give the credit due to M.S. Gorbachev and E.A. Shevardnadze. Over a period of 4 and ½ years, they and their "think tanks" have managed—if we were to stick to naval terminology—to launch pontoons capable of keeping peace afloat. Guarantees are being created that any crises in Europe can be resolved by civilized nonviolent methods.

[Kalyadina] But are there any internal guarantees of the irreversibility of reforms in East Europe?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] Nothing will bring these countries back to the Stalinist model. It has collapsed irreversibly. The only question is this: What will be the outcome of "renewal" in these states, and which path will they take—the social-democratic or the somewhat more traditional bourgeois path.

[Kalyadina] Looking again into the future, how will the changes in East Europe change the image of the socialist community?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] "Community" is another word from the vocabulary which gave us, for example, "harmonious family of peoples" and "fraternal countries." These are anachronisms which no longer reflect political realities. What is the meaning of "fraternal?" A confusing and vague idea. After all, come to think of it, Cain was Abel's brother.

What was the meaning of applying the "family" vocabulary in international relations? Family ethics tells us: Heed your elder, support each other in misfortune, don't worry about money, don't wash dirty linen in public. If there is a freak in the family, this is a cross to be borne. After all, Dracula-Ceausescu was covered up until the very last—only by shameful silence, thank God. Money was lent to bankrupt politicians. Is it generally good when relations between countries are built on a quasi-money basis? Ever greater emphasis was placed on shared ideological values. And so, "fraternal" ethics led us to the point where millions of our citizens mindlessly repeat to this day that we apparently feed all of East Europe and that is why we have to tighten our belts. And the Romanians believed that we were eating them out of house and home. Where are the shared ideological values?

[Kalyadina] Do you mean that the term "fraternal assistance" is also flawed?

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] Would you kindly tell me in what way our "fraternal" assistance to Mongolia is fundamentally different from the assistance rendered by U.S., British, French, or Italian citizens to the earthquake victims in Armenia. Or, look at the assistance to famine victims in Africa. Of course, the principles of humanism must operate in relations between people, peoples, and states. Of course, backward countries must be helped. The only point is not to claim the monopoly right to human brotherhood. Furthermore, the various forms of aid are not pure altruism—after all, if the gap between levels of development opens up and becomes an abyss, the world could be shaken by unprecedented cataclysms.

I don't know what help to others, weaker than ourselves, we can afford under present circumstances. I know one thing: It is now extremely important for the course of all world processes to know how and when we will stabilize our own economy.

And our future relations with East European countries must become conventional interstate relations between friendly but independent and sovereign states linked by common interests.

[Kalyadina] And finally, one last question. Are the transformations in East European countries a contribution toward the building of a "common European home?"

[Pavlova-Silvanskaya] You know, I very recently had a chat with a counselor of the West German Embassy in Moscow. Speaking of East Europe, he muttered: "Previously, we used to look at you and think: 'What are they doing over there, inside their cage?' And we suddenly felt that all this has a direct effect on us." The tumultuous events of the last few months gave a real political content to what was initially a rather abstract image of the European home. This has a direct effect on everyone in our continent.

A new world is being created today not just in East Europe, but everywhere. And it can be built only through joint efforts.

West Europe

France's Dumas Cited on USSR-EEC Cooperation

PM0401142590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "New Impetus for Cooperation"]

[Text] Paris—The reaching of an agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EEC is an important and particularly symbolic act, Roland Dumas, French foreign minister, who signed this document on behalf of the EEC, said in a recent interview with the newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS. This cooperation has become possible thanks to the new world situation which has taken shape as a result of the political changes and reforms implemented by M.S. Gorbachev. The agreement is a concrete manifestation of the new political and economic dimensions which we want to give to relations between the European Community and the Soviet Union.

Under this document, R. Dumas noted, both sides are obliged to gradually eliminate discriminatory measures impeding economic exchange. The document also defines specific spheres of cooperation and technical assistance. They concern industry, agriculture, the environment, and vocational training. The agreement on joint research in the sphere of the safety of nuclear electric power stations is also a constituent part of the document.

This treatment must be examined in the context of the all-around changes which the EEC's relations with other East and Central European countries have undergone, the minister went on to say. Economic cooperation and exchanges have received new impetus thanks to the agreements previously concluded with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. Now a similar treaty has been signed with the Soviet Union. These agreements are all part of the general process of these countries' integration in the international economy.

That is why we wanted the Soviet Union to receive GATT observer status as rapidly as possible, the minister stressed. U.S. President G. Bush, he pointed out, agreed to this in principle during his recent meeting with French President F. Mitterrand. The United States has also supported the decision to create a European Bank of Reconstruction and Development.

In the middle of January, R. Dumas went on to say, I will chair a conference in Paris which will aim to create such a bank. The bank's status will be asserted and the size of its capital determined at the conference.

Regarding the question of developing Soviet-French trade and economic ties, R. Dumas called on French industrialists to activate their efforts and follow the example of their West German and Italian colleagues. French businessmen must act as fast as possible so as not to be left behind, the minister stressed.

Armenian SSR Warned Not To Demand Turkish Land

NC0201091090 Istanbul MILLIYET in Turkish 27 Dec 89 p 9

[Text] Ankara—The Soviet Union has responded to the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic's [SSR] demand for land from Turkey by strongly warning Armenia that "as long as it is within the framework of the Soviet Union it cannot demand land from Turkey."

The Soviet Embassy in Ankara disclosed this yesterday. Before addressing a news conference, Press Secretary Vladimir Georgiyev said that Moscow "has felt uneasy by the statement made by the deputy leader of the Motherland Party, Halil Ozsay, to the effect that Turkey cannot remain a mere onlooker toward developments in Azerbaijan." Georgiyev said: "We find this statement to be out of place. Interference in our internal affairs by one of the neighboring and friendly countries cannot be accepted."

Georgiyev asserted that developments in the Soviet Union were aimed at achieving independence and freedom. He said: "However, the freedom that has been gained by the republics does not give a right to anyone to interfere in their internal affairs." Georgiyev noted that such an attempt may cause repercussions.

Later, Georgiyev answered journalists' questions. Replying to a journalist who recalled a demand by the "Armenian Supreme Soviet for land from Turkey," and asked if the "Soviet Government supported this demand," Georgiyev asserted: "Various republics have been adopting decisions which conflict with our Constitution and laws. The newly esablished commission on constitutional matters is trying to rectify the contradictions. However, I can openly and clearly say that the Soviet Union is not demanding land from any country. Nor will it make any such demand in the future. As long as Armenia remains within the framework of the Soviet Union, it cannot demand land from Turkey. The supreme bodies in the Soviet Union carry weight in matters relating to Soviet borders."

Asked whether an official assurance has been given to the Turkish Government in that regard, Georgiyev replied: "Our stand on the question of a demand for land is so clear that there is no need for an assurance."

Regarding the developments in Romania, Georgiyev said: "Although Ceausescu and his wife deserved to face the firing squad, the process conflicted with the rules that are applied in the 20th century."

Noting that the Soviet Union supports the Romanian people's wish to establish a democratic system, Georgiyev stressed that "they were in continuous contact with the Romanian National Salvation Front and that they have dispatched medical supplies to that country." He added that the Soviet Union is prepared to do everything it can to help save Emre Aygen, a Turkish journalist who was wounded in Romania, if it is asked to do so.

PRAVDA Views FRG Attitudes on German Unity

PM0401121590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own Correspondent Ye. Grigoryev dispatch: "On the Threshold of the Nineties: View from Bonn: When Emotions Cool Down"]

[Text] Bonn, Jan—On the eve of a new year we turn our thoughts to the future. What lies ahead? How will life shape up? It is federal election year in the FRG. But on the threshold of the nineties the public here are more keenly concerned with the prospects for pan-German affairs.

The revolutionary change in the GDR toward a fundamental restructuring and renewal have led to major improvements in the country. A year ago no one would

have thought that the wall would crumble, the Brandenburg Gate would open, and free contact between citizens of the two German states would become reality. In a little under 2 months, 14 million people travelled to the FRG from the GDR—the overwhelming majority of the latter's population. As yet there is no figure for the traffic in the opposite direction but it will be impressive, too. In effect the most painful question of the German nation's postwar life has been removed, a question which to a large extent soured the whole European atmosphere.

Now that the chiming of the Christmas bells has faded and the eruption of emotions is dying away the majority surely understand that war must never again begin on German soil. Chancellor Kohl, delivering a report on his visit to the GDR in a speech in the Bundesrat (the Chamber of the Lands), noted that patience and circumspection are needed now. And here is the Christmas message from Federal President R. von Weizsaecker. He said among other things: "We do not seek a separate German path into an isolated future. It is natural that as Germans we are closer to each other than the other Europeans, we Germans are one people. But the question now is also about the great joint progress toward a Europe in which we will each be able to help one another. The success of perestroyka in the Soviet Union is in our common interest."

At the same time it is difficult to talk about a thoroughly balanced line in Bonn's conduct at the moment. It is being noticeably influenced not only by various circles and forces but also by electoral considerations and sometimes even by emotions. The disputes and antagonisms will even increase, I think, as the election campaigns in the FRG and the further processes of renewal in the GDR develop.

To a large extent the so-called "Kohl plan" is a summation of feelings in official circles. The elaboration of the plan was even kept secret from Foreign Minister Genscher who was given the task of explaining and justifying this fait accompli in a number of capitals. West German critics see in those document signs of extreme haste. Why is that?

The fact is that the fundamental change in the GDR came as a complete surprise for political circles in the FRG. Chaos reigned in government and parliamentary circles. The scale of the events demanded an appropriate response and new thinking. It was in this situation that the 10-point "Kohl plan" was unveiled in the Bundestag on 28 November. In so doing the Chancellor seized the initiative from his rivals. On the domestic political plane I feel that this was his masterstroke.

On condition of free elections in the GDR, Kohl's "phased plan" envisages cooperation on a considerable scale, the creation of "confederative structures" between the two German states with the subsequent attainment of a "federation, that is, a German federal state organization." A number of the conditions (akin to instructing the state leadership how to behave toward opposition groups) are such that if they were made to Bonn, for example, they would be regarded as intolerable interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and UN member. For all the assurances of fidelity to West European integration and the absolute need to place "intra-German relations" within the all-European process, the plan in the context of the proposed practical steps stressed that "reunification, meaning the restoration of German state unity, remains the Federal government's political objective."

Many commentaries here noted that in the international and European aspect the advancement of the Bonn program was a failure. As Genscher figuratively said, it is simply that it is not German reunification that is on the agenda now but German destiny. And that is indissolubly linked in our age with the destinies of the other peoples of Europe. It is precisely here that a considerable section of the country's political and social circles see present day priorities. There was great bewilderment, both in the FRG itself and abroad, at the fact that the Chancellor acted off his own bat. He didn't consult any of the allies even though the it concerns one of the most important questions in world and European policy and history.

It is clear what conclusions Bonn has drawn from that reaction. During the Dresden talks between the leaders of the GDR and the FRG, attention was focused on practical questions of cooperation, expanding its treaty basis, and implementing the idea of a "contractual community" put forward by the GDR. In recent speeches Kohl has been stressing the priority of the integration of the EEC and the Helsinki process. "After the diplomatic failure of his 10-point plan, the Federal Chancellor has been treading warily," a Frankfurt newspaper commentator said ironically. "Recently he has even been laughing at those people who thought that reunification was planned for the near future."

But the plan remains. The ruling parties have taken it as a guide in German politics. It is not easy to oppose it in the conditions that exist in West Germany. This has had the greatest impact on the Social Democrats, who at first almost united in support of the "10 points" in the Bundestag. The situation was to be rectified by the statement of the "Germans in Europe," prepared after keen debates and approved by the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] policy congress in West Berlin in December. Outwardly this program does not seem to offer a contrast. Its ultimate goals are the unity and freedom of Germany. The Social Democrats want a confederation of the two German states and they want it "soon." They perceive the possibility of such a construction even given the existence of the two alliances. But the order of priorities is different. Here it is the unification of Europe and the creation of a European peace order, the Helsinki process of European security and cooperation as the "path to the future." The Social Democratic program for FRG-GDR cooperation is presented more clearly and in an even tone not limited to the economy and communications. It also proposes joint specific

initiatives to accelerate disarmament, including the removal of all nuclear weapons from the two states' territory, the reduction of defense budgets, and so forth. The statement includes the formula put forward by W. Brandt, the honorary chairman of the SPD, which is in circulation not just in Social Democrat circles. The formula is: "Let that which belongs to each other grow together." Clearly, such a formula does not exclude flexibility or a consideration of the real facts. However, the voters, I think, will still find it difficult to discern in all this an alternative to the Kohl plan.

The program speech by Oskar Lafontaine, deputy chairman of the SPD and prime minister of the Saarland, took an original stance. He stated that on the German question the Social Democratic opposition should highlight the unity of people, rather than of states. The criterion of social justice must be the decisive factor. In his words, a recurrence of national and national-state thinking cannot be allowed to oust the global problems of the destruction of the environment, the impoverishment of the Third World, and the persisting nuclear threat. There must be no room for a revival of nationalism. The future, Lafontaine said, belongs to the political models which link international cooperation and regional development. Some newspapers are expressing the opinion that such views can expect to find popularity not only among Social Democrats but also among broad social circles.

The voices of circles, organizations, and publications of a more right-wing, nationalist type continue to be heard quite loudly in the discussions in West Germany. German reunification slogans, aimed furthermore at the "1937 borders," have always provided scope for their propaganda and intrigues. The same is true today. "The grim nationalist politicians are playing with fire, gabbling about how the so called reunification can and should happen quite soon and, furthermore, without regard for the other Europeans," the FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU warns. However, it goes on, the majority of politicians and citizens throughout the country know that reality is much more complex."

Indeed, there have been virtually no nationalist outbursts or demonstrations in favor of reunification noticed among the FRG's population, even though, when questioned, approximately three-quarters favor unification. Sections of the FRG population continue in the West German press to register their concern at the continuing influx of GDR migrants into their country. There were more than 300,000 last year. The main reason is the difference in material living conditions. Apart from the consequences for the GDR itself, this threatens to aggravate the social situation in the FRG, for example, unemployment and housing problems. Circumstances have forced Bonn to abandon its prior conditions for aiding the rapid and effective economic development of the GDR. That is the aim of the recent accords between the two governments and other urgent measures that have been proposed.

What next? Plans, ideas, and illusions are being tested by reality, considered, and selected.

In a historical reference, publicist R. Leicht considers that the "two German states should be more firmly linked by the European order than between themselves. A European confederation—and this shows us how long a path awaits us—must precede a German one... Furthermore, until disarmament achieves its goal and the conflict between the blocs has been eliminated any attempt at a German confederation would stretch the string to breaking point." The philosopher and physicist Karl Friedrich Weizsaecker says: "We must not follow the development of events in the GDR with our schoolboy homilies. We must give effective economic help." And again: "It is a question of opening for Europe the path toward cooperation, collaboration, and contacts. It will be a long time until all involved see for themselves that this concerns them. And then the German problem will become a small problem whose solution will suit everyone. But first there must be restraint, restraint, and more restraint!" Such conclusions occur increasingly often in the discussions here. But the debates on the urgent themes in the FRG continue. Life too. In life and not just in politics the German question is becoming an increasingly significant reality on the threshold of the nineties.

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Bases Predicted To Remain in Panama After 2000

LD0401211690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 4 Jan 90

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Boris Andrianov]

[Excerpts] You probably know already that on Wednesday evening the former commander in chief of Panama's National Defense Forces, General Manuel Noriega, gave himself up to U.S. soldiers and left the Vatican residence in the Panamanian capital. I will ask my colleague, Yuriy Isayev to talk in more detail about recent events in that country. [passage omitted]

[Isayev] That the U.S. intervention was a tragedy for the Panamanian people cannot be doubted. Several hundred dead, thousands injured, whole residential areas destroyed as a result of barbaric bombing, hundreds of thousands of people homeless. I do not intend at all to idealize the figure of the aforementioned general, who was capable during an upsurge in national feeling of striking a rostrum with a machete during a meeting of thousands, or like some character in a cheap operetta, announcing that Panama was at war with the United States.

Involvement with drugs is also quite possible. Of course, the fact that in the last decade the military had practically unlimited power in Panama did not help the development of democracy in any way. All this is true,

but today they are already trying to heap all possible and impossible sins on Noriega's head. So, for example, the new Panamanian vice president, Ford, announced that Noriega worked for the CIA, the Medellin cartel, and even the KGB. Reports have appeared that this overthrown general was involved in the death of Omar Torrijos, although it has been documented that his plane crashed as a result of a bomb planted by U.S. secret service agents. Of course, Noriega today is being blamed for all the economic troubles, as if there had never been a blockade of almost 3 years by the United States, economic and political provocations, or the seizure of Panamanian assets in the U.S. banks.

Today, a large army of U.S. congressmen and experts has landed in Panama. They are studying the situation, determining the extent of future aid, and promising the Panamanian people literally hills of gold. Of course, a generous stream of dollars is pouring into this country; that is completely natural, for it is necessary to maintain good relations with the people on whose territory your military bases are situated.

Today it is no longer necessary to doubt that these bases will stay in Panama after the year 2000 as well. And although the U.S. President said at a news conference in the White House that the four main tasks in Panama have been fulfilled—namely the capture of Noriega, the defense of U.S. soldiers, the restoration of democracy, and the defense of the Panama Canal—I think that the superpower had a fifth main task, namely to preserve its military presence in such a strategically convenient place. It was precisely for this reason that a government suitable to Washington was sworn in. I will remind you that before the election campaign the opposition candidate and now Panamanian President, Guillermo Endara, said openly that if he were to come to power then the existing treaties on the Panama Canal would be reexamined.

In conclusion, I would like to say a few words on the moral aspect of the so-called U.S. operation in Panama. We will not act against our conscience and tone down our appraisal; let us speak frankly and openly. The actions of the U.S. Administration are an act of aggression, a violation of the sovereignty of another country, and no matter what noble goals conceal such actions, their essence remains invariable: The United States has once more taken up the role of the international policeman. The world community has concertedly condemned this relapse into the past, this gunboat diplomacy. It demands the immediate withdrawal of the U.S. occupying troops from Panama.

U.S. Planning Troop Withdrawal From Panama

LD0401203390 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Washington January 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy:

General Colin Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, leaves for Panama today in order to draw up a plan of the withdrawal of U.S. troops from that country together with General Maxwell Thurman, commander of the U.S. Southern Command. This was reported today by U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney in an interview with the CBS Television Company.

According to Cheney, the withdrawal of troops will take several weeks. Previously, at a press conference in the White House on the occasion of the arrest of General Noreiga, President George Bush said: "On Wednesday, December 20th, I ordered U.S. troops to Panama with four objectives: to safeguard the lives of American citizens, to help restore democracy, to protect the integrity of the Panama Canal treaties and to bring General Manuel Noriega to justice. All these objectives have now been achieved... the first U.S. combat troops have already been withdrawn from Panama. Others will follow as quickly as the local situation will permit".

Speaking in the morning CBS programme, Cheney pointed out that the point at issue was not the withdrawal from Panama of the troops that were deployed there before December 20 under the command of General Thurman. He said that one should bear in mind that the U.S. troops had been deployed in Panama for a very long time, that the U.S. had had a large military contingent there long before General Noriega had come to office and that U.S. troops would remain in Panama in the future within the framework of the Panama Canal Treaty.

Cuban TV Interview With Fidel Castro Reported

PM0301175990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 90 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "F. Castro Interview"]

[Text] Havana, 2 Jan—No one and nothing will be able to hold Cuba up in its progress along the path of socialism. Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, and president of the republic's Council of State and Council of Ministers, stated this.

Last year, he pointed out in an interview with Cuban television, the republic's working people made selfless efforts to successfully fulfill a number of programs to accelerate socioeconomic development. Many of them have been completed just now, particularly the construction of several polyclinics, special schools, kindergartens, and a number of other facilities in the capital. F. Castro noted successful progress in implementing industrial programs, including in the nuclear power and metallurgical sphere, and also the successes of the working people in agriculture. Here the Cuban leader pointed to the importance of developing foreign tourism in the country—a sphere which is very promising.

Our people possess all the necessary moral and political qualities to successfully confront any problems, F.

Castro stated, stressing the Cubans' loyalty to socialism's ideals, and their courage and revolutionary spirit. The Cuban leader expressed gratitude to the republic's people for their willingness to fulfill any internationalist mission.

PCCh Document on Role of Pinochet, Armed Forces

PY0201162790 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2100 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] A document issued by the Communist Party of Chile [PCCh] states that the Armed Forces must be fully subordinate to the president elected by the people. It also gives the PCCh's opinion on the draft Armed Forces charter that the regime intends to impose in Chile, stating that a law of this nature must be analyzed by the future congress and the citizenry in general in view of its significance for the political and institutional future.

The document, which is signed by Fanny Pollarolo and Carlos Alves, points out that the intention of General Pinochet's administration to establish a government to parallel the one constitutionally elected by the people represents a great source of conflict.

Regarding the grounds on which the regime is proposing its draft bill, the PCCh states that the regime has used institutionalization, order, and security over the years as an excuse to justify a brutal war against the Chilean people, who were regarded as the internal enemy.

The aforementioned draft law is based on these same grounds, with the Armed Forces high command intent on becoming the guardian of the institutional process. The document states that this idea must be dismissed.

The document also refers to the role and power that the regime is granting to the commanders of the Armed Forces, placing their authority above that of the president of the Republic.

The PCCh document states that General Pinochet's intention to exercise an hegemonic role over the Navy and the Air Force is inadmissible, as is his determination to remain as commander in chief of the Army. The declaration ends by stating that Pinochet must leave.

CPSU Sends Condolences on Arismendi Death

PM2912143589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 89 Second Edition p1

[CPSU Central Committee message on death of Rodney Arismendi, chairman of the Communist Party of Uruguay]

[Text] To the Communist Party of Uruguay Central Committee.

Dear comrades!

Soviet Communists and our country's working people learned with deep grief of the death of Rodney Arismendi, chairman of the Communist Party of Uruguay Central Committee.

A tireless fighter for the interests of the working people and for peace, democracy, and socialism has departed this life. It was to these great ideals that Arismendi devoted the whole of his multifaceted practical and theoretical work and his brilliant revolutionary talent. An ardent patriot and convinced internationalist, he made a great contribution to strengthening fraternal relations between the Communist Party of Uruguay and the CPSU and developing friendship between the peoples of Uruguay and the Soviet Union.

The CPSU Central Committee expresses deep condolences to the Communist Party of Uruguay Central Committee, all Uruguayan Communists, and the people of Uruguay.

A radiant memory of Arismendi, loyal son of the Uruguayan people, will remain forever in our hearts.

We ask you to convey our sincere condolences to the friends and relatives of Rodney Arismendi.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

Congress of People's Deputies

Magazine Publishes Ryzhkov Congress Report

LD0401172390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Summary] A collection of materials on the Second Congress of People's Deputies has been published by POLITIZDAT carrying the government report and Ryzhkov's concluding words on improving the economy.

Sakharov's Undelivered Speech on Legal Code

90UN0557A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 52, 27 Dec 89 p 2

[Final undelivered speech of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov for the USSR Second Congress of People's Deputies: "What He Did Not Succeed in Saying"]

[Text] **You have before you the text of a speech of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, which he was unable to deliver at the Congress of People's Deputies. A text that he literally completed in the last minutes of his life. It would seem that the question that he wanted to raise is purely "technical": What will change in the life of the country if those who are not its very best representatives can be held under investigation, not for 9 months, but up to a year and a half, (and in real practice, even up to 5 years!), and until they confess! Because in the final analysis, it is necessary to stop the wave of crime that has poured down on the country. Thus, what was he concerned about? For whom did he suffer? For us. For all of us, as he did throughout life. The appeals can be heard more and more frequently: If it is necessary to arrest millions for the peace and security of the remainder—let us arrest them. Louder and louder voices can be heard to return once again to the practice of "revolutionary legality," trampling the roots of a law-governed state. Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov had a premonition about this danger. We heed the voice of our great compatriot. I ask for a response to the proposal of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, which he was not able to report to the congress and to Procurator General of the USSR A. Ya. Sukharev.**
[Signed] Yuriy Shchekochikhin, USSR People's Deputy.

On 28 November, the USSR Supreme Soviet reviewed a draft law submitted by the Procurator General of the USSR "On the Introduction of Changes and Additions to Article 34 of the Principles of Criminal Legal Procedure of the USSR and Union Republics." In the first vote, the law was adopted in the Soviet of the Union, but it did not pass in the Soviet of Nationalities. In such an event, a conciliation commission has to be established (as was also explained by Anatoliy Ivanovich to members of the Supreme Soviet), and another vote has to be taken in both chambers. However, the chairman declared that the Soviet of the Union will not vote again. After an intermission, the Soviet of Nationalities voted a second time. And Anatoliy Ivanovich declared that the law was adopted. This is a serious formal violation. We should be careful in the Supreme Soviet and in the congress that similar incidents are not repeated. This is the first thing. Second: At the same meeting, Comrade Oborin, responding to questions of members of the Supreme Soviet about how this question is decided in Western countries, misled the members of the Supreme Soviet (it is possible that he was incorrectly informed by staff workers who prepared the question, but this does not alter the essence of the matter). I made an inquiry to the Institute of State Construction and Legislation, and on 6 December I received a report, which I transmit to the presidium. Briefly, these are its general propositions. First, the question of procedures and terms of arrest is under the control of judicial organs in all countries. Second, everywhere a lawyer is permitted from the moment of arrest, in connection with which there is an institution of on-duty lawyers. Third, nowhere is the investigation combined with the office of the public prosecutor, which is called on to look after the legality of the conduct of an investigation. Concerning certain countries: Great Britain—England and Wales do not have instructions on a time limit but in Scotland it is from 110 days and Parliament is presently considering a law to introduce Scotland's time limit for the entire country. In the United States, it is 180 days, and it cannot be extended even under extraordinary cases (paragraph 3174, item 18 of the U.S. Penal Code). Austria: The customary maximum time limit of 6 months can be extended up to a year in grave crimes, and up to 2 years for especially grave crimes, but only by the court, and the court at any stage of an investigation can and must verify the grounds for arrest. The FRG: The maximum time limit of 6 months can be extended in exceptional cases, but only by the edict of a higher court of the land, and if the investigation after the extension lasts more than 3 months, then the court is obliged,I emphasize obliged, to review the grounds for the extension.

Although the first—formal—reason is quite sufficient to abrogate an illegally enacted law, I believe that also important in its abrogation is the fact that members of the Supreme Soviet were incorrectly informed, and at the very least the persons providing the information must be sufficiently answerable. I should also draw your attention to the fact that the draft law was submitted to the Supreme Soviet for review by the Procurator General. That is, instead of overseeing adherence to the law, the office of the prosecutor, in the person of its highest head, is attempting to give itself free rein and again plunge the country into a web of lawlessness as in the times of the cult of personality, stagnation, and other rather dismal times.

Now on the matter of changes to Article 34. I have already spoken at the Supreme Soviet, and I will repeat myself here. In reality, in our life a suspect or the accused finds himself under extremely difficult conditions in the pressure of the investigation. Everyone has memories of numerous cases of self-implication, admission of guilt because of confinement in a cell with hardened criminals, beatings, blackmail, and threats. Everyone remembers death sentences for the innocent that were carried

out not only in the republics, but in Moscow as well. The prolongation of an investigation for which there is no need at all (the 9 months allowed now is a rather long period) brutalizes our legislation which is already dehumanizing, and for which there is no necessity. This does not improve the results of the fight against crime, and it will only further brutalize our already seriously sick society. The entire country justly sees a new lie in the new law. For we have spoken so much about humanization of legislation, but the only thing that we have brought forth is this lawless law.

I formulate these proposals:

1. By a vote of the congress now, to abrogate the USSR Law on the Introduction of Changes and Additions to Article 34 "Principles of Criminal Legal Procedures of the USSR and the Union Republics."

2. To review this law only simultaneously with a joint review of the question of recourse to a lawyer and of removing investigation from the office of the prosecutor, and in such a way that changes in Article 34 can be introduced only if investigation is removed from the office of the prosecutor and after effecting the law concerning recourse to a lawyer from the moment of arrest or the start of an investigation.
[Signed] People's Deputy A.D. Sakharov. 14 December 1989

Reporters Evaluate Congress TV Coverage

90US0307A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 16 Dec 89 p 2

[Report on interview with a group of Soviet TV reporters covering the proceedings of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies by Ye. Chekalova; date and place not given: "Reporters in the Parliament"]

[Text] "For the first time" and even "for the first time in history"—this is how we referred to the First Congress of People's Deputies and subsequent meetings of the Supreme Soviet. The fundamental novelty of these events in domestic political life presupposed the fundamental novelty of their TV coverage. Live and complete broadcasting from the congress and the stream of sharp unedited information—all of this also happened for the first time. We watched live broadcasts in the morning and during the day, and in the evening we sometimes saw a slightly different picture in the TV reports of the Vremya program. The genre of parliamentary reporting is only emerging at Central TV. However, four young TV reporters, Vladislav Flyarkovskiy, Dmitriy Kiselev, Petr Orlov, and Sergey Medvedev, have already become familiar on the TV screen. All of them are about 30 or slightly older. Does this mean that their views are similar? In general, what is the personal attitude of those who have been entrusted with interviewing our deputies? Here is the transcript of a conversation which was held on the day the Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies opened and on the eve of the discussion of the Press Law.

[Chekalova] One frequently hears accusations of bias leveled at you. Some say: The TV reporters largely give the floor to the left radicals, members of the interregional group of deputies. Supposedly, the same people are on the air all the time: N. Shmelev, G. Popov, Yu. Chernichenko. On the other hand, others are dissatisfied because TV reporters do not let the above deputies and like-minded people make their point in full. On what principle do you select the people you talk with, after all?

V. Flyarkovskiy: Indeed, I have interviewed Gavriil Popov many times. Here is why: He is competent. For me, this is the determining factor in selecting a person to interview. This is not at all to say that I gravitate only toward brilliant speakers who are capable of immediately countering any retort or commenting on any situation as, for example, Sobchak. I introduced Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev who spoke just two or three times but as a result two substantive amendments in the legislation on the judicial system were made. Now I have in my bag his new draft law on jury trials and I am convinced that he will push it through and will not rest until he does. As I see it, Yakovlev is a highly professional parliamentarian.

In America as well, Senator Jackson became popular due to the constitutional amendment named after him rather than due to his oratory. In general, as far as I know, law, state structure, political science, and economic specialists account for 90 percent of the membership of Western governments. Our Supreme Soviet resembles a popular assembly more than it does a Western government. Here is a characteristic episode: An agitated woman comes to the speaker's stand. She says: "I feel that I will not be given the floor again, this is why I would like to say the following..." Lukyanov asks her: "Are you speaking on the amendment?" She answers: "I will also talk about the amendment, but first about something else..." Understanding this peculiarity of our parliament, I always accommodate those who themselves are very much interested in speaking into the microphone.

S. Medvedev: Indeed, sometimes it happens that the same people keep appearing on the air. But we will never protect ourselves against criticism, no matter what, even if we allocate time for appearances by representatives of various deputy groups with mathematical precision. Certainly, the circle of people we interview needs to be enlarged. However, if a person speaks colorlessly and unconvincingly he will not end up on the air, and the other way around. This is the principle.

P. Orlov: I do not pick people to interview based on my biases. I am prepared to talk to those to whom I feel antipathy. To be sure, there are deputies, and quite a few of them, whose point of view is extremely hard to discern. They always vote with the majority but cannot ever explain their position intelligibly. It is difficult to work with them. Besides, I do not believe that I have a right to wring something out of someone. I never classify the deputies into "the left" and "the right." Tell me, how can Sakharov and Yeltsin be lumped together? I was the

first to file an episode on the interregional group of deputies, but I did not put an exclamation mark on it: For me, this was one event out of many. Undoubtedly, there are groupings in the parliament. However, it is more important to show the essence of their programs.

D. Kiselev: Unfortunately, the element of chance in our selection of a person to interview is considerable. We have no access to the auditorium; there are many exits from it, and sometimes I just cannot find the people I need. However, I have not interviewed Popov, Shmelev, or Chernichenko once, and in general I have not approached any member of the interregional group. I do so purposely, fearing accusations of bias, despite—believe me—great temptation: These people are very competent. On the other hand, it is difficult to find a deputy who would defend the point of view of the majority convincingly. However, I seek persistently and try to get the person talking so that he begins to think on the basis of common sense. Say, Director General of the Stavropol Broiler Combine Postnikov votes with the majority. However, in talking to him we have come to the conclusion that restrictions on state ownership, and collective ownership are what we should fight for at present. "Are you prepared to make this the goal of your parliamentary activities?" He said: "Yes." Thus, one of the ideas of the interregional group was espoused by a person completely alien to it. To my mind, the main point is to reflect the essence of parliamentary struggle, and this should not necessarily be done with the words of G. Popov.

[Chekalova] Parliamentary debates are a subject in which your Western colleagues are keenly interested. They have managed to state their opinion of your work in the press. For example, the well-known American correspondent D. Trimble writes: "I like young journalists reporting from the sessions of the Supreme Soviet. At times, they allow themselves sharply critical remarks. However, they never espouse a position to the left of the government." Further on, he says that your activities boil down to interpreting the officially accepted point of view. Do you agree with this opinion? Are you indeed entirely dependent people?

S. Medvedev: When I was preparing materials on the past session I did not once ask my management for advice. I did what I saw fit, and they did not rebuff me once for this though they possibly could have. Unfortunately, during the 10 years of my work at the Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] they have implanted an inner censor in me, and it is very difficult to get rid of him.

V. Flyarkovskiy: I am dependent. I am hampered by inner and outer restraint which is imposed by the impact of unwritten laws on our work. I want to be independent, but I feel that frequently I am not in a position to defend my independence. There is hardly a journalist who is not familiar with retorts such as "why do you have to bait them" or "it's not bad, but too long" (by that a particular sharp episode is meant). A video episode may be changed without the consent of the author, and all the while the author may fancy himself independent three times over. Meanwhile, it is exactly the man in the picture who suffers moral losses. Besides, the long-established system for punishing the "guilty" continues to operate, up to the so-called removal from the air. This is absolutely absurd: punishment by "non-work." (!) It appears that those who are meting out the punishment consider on-air work an easy and pleasant reward. What are we to do about it all? They rule the roost. It may be that the Law on the Press now in preparation will destroy this principle. As I see it, ministerial hierarchical structures whereby someone will always measure your work against someone's tastes and biases are contraindicated for creative organizations in general. Incidentally, the fact that millions of TV viewers know what goes on on the other side of the screen may play a great role in TV journalists gaining the desired genuine independence. However, the viewer consumes only glasnost as such and, as a rule, does not know what happened before and after it.

P. Orlov: I have never considered myself independent, and still don't. I have signed a contract with the Gosteleradio. It says that I should perform my functions to the best of my ability, and that I express my point of view which the Gosteleradio may or may not accept. I have had conflicts but all of them were resolved without disciplinary measures.

You see, I am a proponent of clear definitions. For example, what is the official point of view? What is meant? The position of the government? That of the Supreme Soviet? Positions of the party which are expressed in one way or another in the speeches by its leaders? Western correspondents are not interested in clarifying this point which provides a lot of opportunity for interpretations by them. Where the materials, draft laws which the government submits to the Supreme Soviet for consideration are concerned, I criticize them if they are objectionable. I do not conceal my attitude toward the decisions of the Supreme Soviet itself. Gorbachev's position is the only thing against which I have not objected openly. Probably, certain notions of the leader exist. It is possible that these notions are outdated but they have not disappeared even now.

D. Kiselev: Being independent means espousing your own point of view. This is unrealistic given the monopoly of state television. In this case, not taking anyone's side is the only way to remain honest. This is why I am in favor of a purely information-oriented style with a minimum of one's own comments. People need facts, whereas we are in a hurry to comment before we report what has happened to begin with.

[Chekalova] Still, what does such objective coverage of the proceedings of the Congress of Deputies or the Supreme Soviet amount to? You can keep strictly to the agenda, or you may show in more depth interesting details which do not fit this agenda but nonetheless are

important in principle and clarify the essence of parliamentary struggle. Why did the TV viewers get the impression that Vremya reports smoothed over and even distorted what was happening at the First Congress of People's Deputies?

S. Medvedev: It is just that the viewers compared Vremya with live broadcasts. Even if you are a genius you cannot squeeze 6 or 7 hours of hard work into a half-hour without some loss of quality. In general, how are we to define what is objective? Any material, even if it is prepared by a group of journalists, even if it reflects "the official point of view," is still subjective. Before the Second Congress, the management oriented us toward being constructive in every way possible. The tension in the country is mounting and we should look for positive, creative aspects together with the deputies. This is why I consider it reasonable that in the course of covering the current congress they proposed that we do more commentary and state our point of view more courageously. Let us see how it works out now.

V. Flyarkovskiy: Strange as it may be, the main point would be lost if we cling strictly to the agenda. The parliament means a process of coming to a decision in the course of sharp conflicts. Showing this actual struggle of positions is most important and complicated. We are used to covering ritualistic production conferences whereas the work of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress is something different in principle. New approaches, new scripting and vocabulary are necessary in this sphere. So, let the TV reporter feel that he is creatively free! I remember that at an editorial meeting a commentator expressed his dissatisfaction with a question which I put to one of the deputies when the draft law on land and property was discussed. The question was as follows: Who owns the cow-shed which I have built on the land which does not belong to me? It seemed to the commentator that I was almost lecturing the deputy with this question. Meanwhile, I wanted him to just forget about the camera, interrupt his enumeration of various points of view, and begin reflecting in front of the viewers.

P. Orlov: The agenda, the details, and the drama are important; however, there have always got to be priorities. It is my duty to show the entire factual aspect of the operation of the parliament even if in the course of it I lose the drama and other artistic refinements. Our lack of objectivity is at times the result of our elementary lack of organization. During the proceedings of the First Congress, sometimes as many as eight TV reporters at a time mobbed the deputies at the first recess. They grabbed the people, piled up interviews, and then rushed to Ostankino to edit. The most important event happened 2 hours later when, alas, nobody or almost nobody was at the Palace of Congresses. We got even the interview with M.S. Gorbachev right after his election to the presidency almost by a miracle, due to the broad shoulders of our cameramen.

D. Kiselev: I understand why the viewers are disappointed: Thus far, television has been the least successful at showing the pitch of political struggle in the parliament. As soon as you begin to seriously show the actual clash of opinions on issues of principle rather than partial issues everyone tries to hold you back—not only management but also your colleagues. One can always justify this for his own benefit: Air time is in short supply, you cannot show it all. However, for me personally an objective Vremya report is the one which includes everything that people who have watched all day long will recount for each other later. Under present circumstances, such objectivity is impossible to fully implement on the screen. It is necessary to set up a special group of deputies at the Supreme Soviet to control the TV coverage of the debate. TV reporters working at the parliament should be selected by this group and report to it rather than to Gosteleradio. For now, objectivity is "safeguarded" by secret instructions from "on high"; important decisions involving coverage of the proceedings of the Congress and the Supreme Soviet are made in the offices of luminaries. On occasion, segments have been taken out of evening shows of meetings which have still been referred to as videotaped live. I believe this to be justified only in the event the decision on omissions is made by the congress itself. In all other cases, we are dealing with misinformation.

Please do not tell me that omissions are made so as to not foster tension in the country. This tension has already been fostered. In Nagorno-Karabakh, the locals and I frequently watched together the TV broadcasts which involved this complex region in one way or another. I saw myself the reaction to information gaps: They cause still greater tension and activization of political struggle. People say: Perhaps, we have not made our presence known loudly enough; we have to do something sharper for them to notice us. On 11 April of this year, I was in Tbilisi and saw a demonstration with the slogan "Shame on the Vremya program!" Ultimately, omission has cost a lot.

[Chekalova] I would like to present the opinion of two more TV journalists, this time members of an older generation, who are also very directly involved in parliamentary reporting on TV.

Oleg Tochilin, chief of the parliamentary group of the Gosteleradio:

On the whole, I accept these remarks by readers. Still, what have we succeeded in, as I see it? First of all, the very coverage of the First Congress and a number of meetings of the Supreme Soviet. We gave up grandiose panoramas, abandoned overall views, and banked on close-ups, details, angles. The viewers see who votes which way, how they react to a particular speech, who takes an active part in the proceedings, and who yawns.

Finally, the matter of organization. At present, a team of three is permanently stationed at the Palace of Congresses (naturally, individuals on the team change) which

follows any unexpected course of events. Two other teams work in the studio on live broadcasts. We are trying to secure a clear-cut division of labor; there is talk about a number of reporters specializing primarily in parliamentary issues. In the coming year, we are likely to get a special studio for preparing parliamentary programs on Kalinin Avenue, in the building where committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet will operate permanently.

Aleksandr Tikhomirov, political commentator of Central Television:

I am not sure that organization has improved fundamentally. Firstly, specialization in parliamentary affairs is at the very least a debatable pursuit: If it occurs we risk ending up with political schemers rather than objective reporters. Secondly, by now we have lost even the negligible number of passes to the auditorium which we had at the First Congress. Naturally, this will increase the number of random interviews.

Are we going to get rid of the distortions of the congress in Vremya? I am not sure. At the First Congress, "telephone rule" applied fully, and we the commentators had to apologize to the viewers several times because quite frequently they would not let us show and analyze on Vremya the events we believed to be important in principle. The old habit of the leadership in Gosteleradio and higher to smooth things over manifested itself.

The First Congress overwhelmed us all. We almost did not try to analyze things ourselves, and we delegated comments to the deputies. Now is time to reveal our own position more clearly. Personally, I am not afraid to admit that I have always been interested in the interregional group. Popov and Travkin have their own, unexpected view of things. They often give me what I do not grasp myself. I may not agree with them, but they are of interest to me. Besides, they are responsible people. Do you remember how well the Abalkin Law on Taxes on the Increment of the Wage Fund was adopted? However, when a wave of protest swept the country those who had voted for this law the day before began to adjust to the mood of the crowd. It was just Travkin who undertook to publicly defend what he had voted for. You would agree that this is indicative.

Finally, some of my latest observations. At the last congress, they said: For now, clear-cut groupings are impossible, everything is still very fuzzy; supposedly, the same person votes with the right on one issue, and with the left on another. Even the first day of this congress shows how the nucleus of the minority has grown and strengthened.

Political & Social

Gorbachev To Visit Lithuania 10-12 Jan

LD0401204690 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] A member of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Rolandas Pavilionis, has said that today's talks with Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow were constructive.

Taking part in the meeting were also members of the Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev and Vadim Medvedev. The Lithuanian Communist Party delegation was led by the first and second secretaries of the Central Committee Algirdas Brazauskas and Vladimir Beriozovas.

Rolandas Pavilionis described the results of the talks as positive. He said that Mikhail Gorbachev was to visit Lithuania from the 10th to the 12th January.

At the end of January, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party is to meet in full-scale session to continue debates on the decision of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party in favor of the party's independence.

Lithuanian Leaders Comment on Visit to Moscow

LD0401132390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Summary] Lithuanian radio commentator Benas Rupeika has contacted Moscow by telephone and spoken with Vladimiras Beriozovas and Justas Paleckis, secretaries of the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] Central Committee after they arrived in Moscow for talks with Gorbachev and other members of the CPSU Central Committee. The telephone conversation was recorded last night.

Asked about the purpose of the visit, Vladimiras Beriozovas said:

"[Begin Beriozovas recording] This meeting was arranged by mutual agreement. We simply want to talk prior to the visit of the general secretary, to somewhat clarify our positions. [end recording]"

Benas Rupeika asked why not all the members of the Bureau of the LCP Central Committee had been included in this group. Beriozovas replied that the present Bureau consists of 19 members and that this seemed too large a group and that therefore a smaller group was chosen.

"[Begin recording] [Rupeika] However, was this choice made by Vilnius, or was it Moscow's choice?

"[Beriozovas] Oh, no. This was Vilnius' choice.

"[Rupeika] Is it not going to be understood that somebody was deliberately left behind?

"[Beriozovas] Well, I do not think so. We decided with good will at a meeting of our Bureau who should go to Moscow. First of all we decided that all four secretaries should go, then the new secretaries should also get a taste of the fight.

"[Rupeika] By the way, they have not yet been baptized into it, as used to be the case before.

"[Beriozovas] It seems that there is not much baptizing going to take place. We have already baptized them into it at the 20th Congress.

"[Rupeika] It is good to hear that you are in such high spirits on the eve of the meeting. Are we to understand that the visit by Gorbachev is being postponed for some time later?

"[Beriozovas] According to the available information he will come [to Lithuania] next week and that is why we have decided to meet once again and to talk things over. [end recording]"

Beriozovas added that the group will return to Lithuania on Friday evening [5 December].

"[Begin recording] [Rupeika] Have the—what do you call them—the alternative ones, been invited to come too? Are they coming to Moscow too?

"[Beriozovas] I do not know, but it was on our initiative to hold talks only with us. [end recording]"

Rupeika also spoke with Justas Paleckis, newly elected secretary for ideology. When asked how he was, he said he was fine, because:

"[Begin Paleckis recording] I saw and I felt how this visit came about, how it took shape. I think this is a mutual wish to gain a better knowledge of each other's positions, to define them more precisely so that that no misunderstandings could take place later." [end recording]

Benas Rupeika then asked Justas Paleckis if the meeting was simply an order to visit Moscow:

"[Begin Paleckis recording] On the contrary, I believe that the idea was conceived both here in Vilnius [as heard] and in Moscow. And because the idea was rather similar in Vilnius and Moscow it was not difficult to come to an agreement.

"The journalists in Lithuania as well as the people of Lithuania have already noticed that on many occasions some Politburo members arriving have had very poor briefings about what is actually going on in Lithuania. And it would be not right for our general secretary to be given information which is not entirely correct." [end recording]

Speaking about the pro-CPSU Lithuanian Communists, Justas Paleckis said that they were in the majority at the previous plenum in Moscow and now it is only right that the other side should be given a chance to speak.

Lithuanian Officials Comment on Gorbachev Talks

LD0401200990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1500 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Telephone conversation among Vladimiras Beriozovas, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; Justas Paleckis, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; and Lithuanian radio commentator Benas Rupeika, after talks with Mikhail Gorbachev; place not given—recorded, conversation broadcast "minutes later"]

[Excerpts] [Rupeika] So, esteemed secretary, we are eager to hear the news.

[Paleckis] Right, esteemed colleague. If I say that I was in good spirits yesterday, then I can now say that I am in even better spirits than I was yesterday. Well, in a sense it was very long, interesting, and packed-with-conversation. Of course, I cannot make comparisons, because this is the first time I have been in a meeting of this kind. However, both Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary, and Vladimiras Beriozovas say the atmosphere was especially very good.

Well, things went the way we hoped, like we said yesterday. Discussions on pressing issues were held in a constructive, friendly, and frank manner, without any attempt to avoid the most acute problems. Although, this is like a diplomatic formulation, a positive attitude lies behind it.

[Rupeika] How long did this meeting last?

[Paleckis] From 11 a.m. until 5 p.m., with 35 minutes for lunch. This means almost 6 hours.

[Rupeika] Who was speaking, how, and about what?

[Paleckis] Practically all the members of the bureau spoke. The meeting was started by Mikhail Gorbachev. His introductory speech was rather interesting, indeed. He spoke about the country's issues and matters concerning Lithuania, as well as global matters. He also spoke about the need to continue the process of democratization, that more reliance should be placed on the masses at all levels, including the party. He spoke about restructuring within the party and about his plans. And, I would say, one could see a well-worded political report, which makes you believe, because strategic interests coincide. If this process continues, the process which was started by progressive forces led by Mikhail Gorbachev, then it looks that Lithuania will also achieve what she wants..

Following this, Algirdas Brazauskas made his speech. His speech was also very impressive and long. Our decisions and our determination to follow the path we had chosen, looking for mutually acceptable decisions without striking an attitude or cutting links with the progressive part of the CPSU—we are the most natural allies and friends with this part of the CPSU—these were given full attention in his speech.

Following this, a live dialogue took place with V. Beriozovas, Romualdas Ozolas, Rolandas Povilionis, Romas Gudaitis, Vladimir Korniyenko, Mindaugas Stakvilevicius....

[Rupeika, interrupting] So, this is from our side?

[Paleckis] Yes, and Vytautas Astrauskas. Then Kestutis Glaveckas and I took part in the dialogue. Apart from the general secretary there were two more secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee. According to the Lithuanian alphabet these would be Aleksandr Yakovlev and Vadim Medvedev.

[Rupeika] Was Eduard Shevardnadze there?

[Paleckis] No, there were only three of them on the side of the receiving party.

[Rupeika] So, Yegor Ligachev was not present either?

[Paleckis] No, he was not. So, on the one side there were the 3 of them and on the other side of the table there were 11 of us. Therefore, we were clearly preponderate in a quantitative sense. Can you hold on a minute, I think my colleague Beriozovas is trying to get into the room. I will open the door. [seconds long pause] I was right. Here he is in his coat, but ready and eager to talk to you.

[Beriozovas] Good evening.

[Rupeika] Good evening to you sir. You did not hear what Justas Paleckis was talking about just a minute ago. I will ask you questions which in a way will be like an extension of our previous conversation. Well, compromises on both sides, is it? Can these already be perceived or are you going to take some time until all that has been said in Moscow has been contemplated?

[Beriozovas] Of course we have to wait. However, we cannot make any compromises because those are the decisions adopted by the congress. And there has virutally been no talk that the decisions adopted by the Congress, the statute or our program, should be recalled. There was no talk about that. We explained our situation, the current position of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and the support for him by the people and Communist Party members. We spoke about the wish of Lithuanian Communist Party members to have an independent Communist Party of Lithuania. I believe that he understood the essence of our conversation. I am also convinced that no attempts will be made to take blocking actions or to make us stop implementation, or anything like this.

[Rupeika] What are the concessions and compromises on the part of the leadership of the CPSU?

[Beriozovas] Well, now this is really very difficult to say, because this is only the opinion of the general secretary. We must understand that this is not the entire Central Committee and one could feel in the conversation that he wants to understand us and that he understands us better than anyone else. However, how he succeeds in this will depend on his visit to our republic.

He said he wanted to visit various working collectives and meet people and talk to them. He wants to meet groups of people and have a frank talk with them. He wants to get properly acquainted with the republic. Therefore, he thinks he might stay for 2 or even 3 days. He said he did not want anything like rallies or large audiences; he simply wants to talk to people and see how Lithuania is living and what makes it tick; how the Lithuanian Communist Party is living.

[Rupeika] Has a concrete date already been decided?

[Beriozovas] No concrete date has yet been fixed, but it will be in the nearest future.

[Rupeika] Was any document adopted after this meeting?

[Beriozovas] No, this dialogue was held with no intention to adopt a document.

[Rupeika] how will it be covered by the press, central television, or radio?

[Beriozovas] You mean this meeting?

[Rupeika] Yes.

[Beriozovas] It appears that it will not be described as some sort of meeting where some joint document was adopted. There will be no such coverage in the media. Well, this is what I think.

[Rupeika] I would like to ask you to speak up because your voice blends in with the background noise.

[Beriozovas] I do not think there will be such coverage because the conversation was not official and it cannot be compared with such things as talks at the Politburo or talks at the Central Committee of the CPSU. This was merely sharing information on both sides.

[Rupeika] Neverthless, could you compare the speech Mikhail Gorbachev made at the plenum and the tone of the dialogue today?

[Beriozovas] Yes, there is a difference; not an insignificant one.

[Rupeika] This was quite an exhausting answer. What is the attitude toward our "alternativists"? I have invited a shorter international name to make things easier for you....

[Beriozovas, interrupting] I would not like to comment on that because he and all four secretaries stayed alone and se spoke about...well, I would not like to comment on these issues.

[Rupeika] It appears that after your arrival back home a step toward confrontation will not be made?

[Beriozovas] Confrontation with whom?

[Rupeika] With the "alternativeists."

[Beriozovas] We do not have any confrontations with them. We have decisions from the congres, and let those who are willing and determined implement them.

[Rupeika] Thank you very much for the interview. When do you plan to leave Moscow?

[Beriozovas] Right now. I am already dressed and we are in a hurry. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] Here is Justas Paleckis again.

[Paleckis] I would only like to say that my personal impression is what I have voiced on many occassions—both on television and in the press—that at this stage our greatest allies are not somewhere else, but in Moscow, in Tallinn, Riga, Leningrad, and so on. After this meeting I would stress even more that our allies are in the city I mentioned first.

[Rupeika] What is your advice to us journalists? How should we look at the relationship between the Lithuanian Communist Party and Moscow?

[Paleckis] Journalists? I think similar to the way the general public looks at it. They are dynamically changing, taking shape within the new CPSU, keeping in mind that the CPSU is also changing. It is not only we who are changing; we have already proven that we are able to change. The CPSU is also capable of changing. By the way, on many occasions today it was said that nobody had to retreat or kneel down. It was said that we are not going to make each other go down on our knees. The CPSU will not make the Lithuanian communist party kneel down nor vice versa. Although, at the moment, little strokes may feel great oaks. We really do not need that. I think dialogue and constructive cooperation, like the dialogue we had today, will indeed help to find the optimal variant of our relationship.

[Rupeika] Well, now you have 1 hour and 50 minutes to rest. Then, be ready to answer similar questions back at home in Lithuania.

[Paleckis] With great pleasure.

Lithuanians Interviewed on Party Split

90UN0556D Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Report on interview with Lithuanian Communist Party congress delegates by unidentified correspondents: "Arduous Path Toward the Truth"]

[Text] Our correspondents turned to congress delegates, communist rank and file, and inhabitants of Vilnius.

V. Antonov, secretary of the Radio Instrumentation Research Institute party committee and delegate to the congress:

"The majority of congress delegates voted for a status of the Lithuanian Communist Party providing for its reorganization virtually into a new party. It is not even a question of it having its own program and statutes but of the majority of the drafts offered for discussion being extremely far removed, not only from the current CPSU Program and Statutes—they planned to make essential changes to them, as you know—but also from our understanding of what these documents should be like. For example, while advocating the utmost democratization of intraparty life, we are categorically opposed to the exclusion of the principle of democratic centralism, as proposed.

"It was not dogmatism, which people are attempting to ascribe to us, that determined our decision. We have created an organizing bureau for the purpose of preventing the disintegration of the existing party structure and avoiding a mass withdrawal from the party. This bureau is to engage in work on the ideological and organizational cohesion of all communists sharing our views. There is no one among them, I believe, who does not understood the vital need for changes in the party. As far as the status of the republic party organizations is concerned, we support a cardinal change therein and their being accorded real independence in the solution of all local problems. We believe that there should be an appreciable change in the practice of their participation in the shaping of the policy of the CPSU and its executive bodies. But all of this should be within the framework of the CPSU! This is the only thing that we have no intention of changing in the activity of our party life."

S. Yuonene, editor of the newspaper VMESTE I NARAVNE and congress delegate: "A. Matsaytis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League, who spoke at the congress, declared that party members advocating unity with the CPSU could in the future find themselves outlawed. What is this if not moral pressure on the delegates and many of the republic's communists? It is strange and disturbing that it is being exerted by a member of the congress' presidium and the leader of a youth organization. Such a position says a great deal."

V. Khadunkin, secretary of the Electrography Research Institute party committee and congress delegate:

"The party may be divided, but not the work force or Lithuania. For the vast majority of us, Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians, it is our sole homeland. It is from this, I believe, that we should proceed: Consolidation on the basis of common communist ideals and values common to all mankind rather than intensification of division.

"The congress' decision was made, in my view, thanks to the strong influence of delegates too much 'in a hurry'. The time of the congress, which had been brought forward, was reflected also. Nonetheless, I believe that the main thing today, and even more so in the future, is to try and forget grievances and do everything to avoid misunderstanding and to smooth over the cracks which are emerging."

A. Gelbakh, deputy editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA:

"Henceforth, Lithuania's communists will determine their actions themselves. They are assuming responsibility for all political decisions, which will not now allow many mistakes and failures to be excused by the 'diktat of the center'. Obviously, factions that will gain an

opportunity to elect their own representatives to the executive bodies will be formed in the Communist Party."

M. Khotenchik, worker at the Vilnius Municipal Telephone Exchange and member of the Socialist Movement for Perestroyka in Lithuania:

"I am not a party member but I would like, nonetheless, to have my say concerning the decisions of the 20th congress. First, the composition of its delegates not only fails to reflect the alignment of forces prior to the congress but also the composition of the party. There were few workers and kolkhoz [collective farm] members and communists who by their labor are creating material values there. Can decisions on behalf of the entire Lithuanian Communist Party be made in their absence? The workers would have prevented a split."

A. Smolyaninov, secretary of the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station party committee:

"My attitude toward the documents of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress that have already been adopted is unequivocal: This means division among the republic's communists and an attempt to split the CPSU and its separation into national compartments. The eternal question: Cui bono? The communists? No, the leaders of 'Sajudis'. They did not dare openly present the idea of the creation of their own party. So they decided to split the Lithuanian Communist Party in the guise of a revival of national self-awareness."

...It is difficult summing up all these statements—the opinions are, as you can see, most varied. However, neither is the concern heard in conversations with inhabitants of Vilnius and appearing in the letters to the editor from the cities and villages of Russia without foundation. When one is tackling some large, difficult undertaking, one wants to be able to rely on a strong comradely shoulder. One believes that our concerns are the same—in the Baltic, in the Novgorod region, in the Far East. One hopes for a high sense of responsibility....

Alternative Lithuanian Party Holds Conference

90UN0556B Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Report by TASS correspondents A. Aladinskiy, Yu. Sizov, and K. Ustsila: "At the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Vilnius—Having voted the day before against a change in the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party and its withdrawal from the CPSU, approximately 160 delegates to the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress held a party conference during the evening of 21 December. While firmly adhering to the platforms of the CPSU and unwilling to split its ranks, these delegates intend to continue to take part in the congress.

At the morning meeting they delivered to the congress delegates a report which said, inter alia, that, having voted for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party within a renovating CPSU, they made the decision to hold a party conference. Its purpose was to consolidate Lithuania's communists sharing the idea of the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party within the CPSU.

An organizing bureau of this conference for current work was formed. It is anticipated that the bureau will participate in the preparation of a special congress of communists adhering to the platform of a united CPSU.

In an interview with the TASS correspondents, Yuozas Kuolyalis, member of the organizing bureau and adviser to the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, said:

"The communists adhering to Marxist-Leninist positions will participate actively in the processes of perestroyka and work in the republic party organizations on preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

"As far as our relations with the reorganized, independent Lithuanian Communist Party, for which over 80% of the delegates voted are concerned, they will be built on an equal, parity basis."

Responding to the question of how many delegates support the idea of the alternative conference to the congress, Yu. Kuolyalis reported that approximately 160 delegates, behind whom were over 32,000 party members, supported it. This is one-fourth of Lithuania's entire party organization. There could have been more supporters of this idea, Kuolyalis explained, had yesterday's ballot on the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party not been individual but secret.

As anxiously related at the congress by the delegates, moral pressure is being put on the communists who are of an opinion different from others.

We believe, Yu. Kuolyalis continued, that the Lithuanian Communist Party has, as the 20th congress has shown, been led around by the republic's opposition forces. In our opinion, the Communist Party leadership has essentially been a tool in the hands of "Sajudis".

The conferees also told the congress that they would abstain in the vote on the draft Lithuanian Communist Party Program and Statutes submitted on 21 December for discussion by the congress delegates.

The congress took note of the information.

Corruption Among Lithuanian Officials Detailed

90UN0512B Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Dec 89 p 4

[Article by G. Konchyus (Vilnius): "Make Sure to Get Your Piece of the Action"]

[Text] It was a scandalous autumn in Lithuania. Each week the public was shocked by reports of abuses of power by leaders of the most diverse ranks. In all cases they were motivated by self-interest.

In Alitus they divided up sections for individual construction. The report prepared by the party gorkom [city committee] and the people's control committee became a regular litany of all kinds of violations. D. Yakshis, the director of the cotton fabric combine, and M. Supronene, the head of the store, obtained their lots right in the gorispolkom [city executive committee], bypassing the long waiting lines in their labor collectives. Construction permits were granted to A. Klastaytis, the city's head artist, and R. Stankyavichene, a salesman, without even an application.

The city's head architect, G. Gabrilavichyus, disposed of the land all by himself. Having spacious state apartments, the chairman of the gorispolkom, N. Yakushkyavichene, her deputy, A. Byarnatavichyuus, and G. Gabrilavichyus himself managed to set themselves up with plots of land and to build an almost three-story single-family dwelling with an area of 190 square meters. And the majority of the builders "forgot" to write down their promises to release their apartments after moving into the separate houses.

The publicity forced all of the Alitus Gorispolkom to resign. Now everyone is waiting for clarifications from the procurator's office: Was it out of kindness or for some kind of recompense that the city's "fathers" were so kind to certain of its residents?

The strange stories were reported by RESPUBLIKA the newspaper of the Lithuanian Sayudis movement. Without distinguishing between "others" and "their own" it listed the names of certain Soviet leaders and bosses of Sayudis who received plots for individual construction in the most prestigious regions of Vilnius or purchased the prestigious apartments they occupied at clearly reduced prices.

Incidentally, the policy of "most favored nation" is practiced with more than just apartments and cottages. In this connection I recall the following conversation.

"A branch of Ingosstrakh is badly in need of a branch in Kaunas," the chief representative of this joint stock company in Vilnius, V. Lebedev, told me. "We found the necessary premises and agreed on a lease. But by a decision of the ispolkom [executive committee] of the gorsovet [city soviet] they were suddenly given to a flower cooperative."

I will add that the Vilnius and Kaunas gorispolkoms also considered it necessary to transfer to the cooperatives commission stores for the sale of automobiles. Even people who are not in the know understand that this is a goldmine. Why are such strange decisions being made? Incidentally, it is formulated differently in the many letters written to the TRUD correspondents' point: How much do they pay when making such bribes?

And here is another typical example. Recently the republic Council of Ministers on the initiative of the Ministry of Trade and Litpotrebsoyuz [Lithuanian Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives] ordered that the surcharge on alcoholic beverages sold in the public catering network be increased significantly. It was a noble goal: The additional money that was obtained was to be used for covering expenditures in unprofitable student and school dining rooms. But at the same time the cafes and restaurants were permitted to sell alcoholic beverages to go. You do not need to be a psychic to see where this will lead: The alcoholic beverages will be bought wholesale in the stores and sold in the restaurants. Even if they had really decided to help the students "at the expense of the booze" why not sell wine with the same surcharge in special stores?

The leaders of the Palanga Gorispolkom take the cake as far as inventiveness in finding the good life at state expense goes. I do not know how television cameraman L. Pigonite managed to gain their trust but five leaders from the mayor's office demonstrated before the camera a measure called "courses in psychotherapy." For an entire week they were sequestered away in a comfortable house, drank liqueurs of medicinal herbs, ate black caviar and other victuals, warmed themselves in the sauna, and with the help of a visiting either psychotherapist or a psychic or a person practicing folk medicine (a local specialist called them charlatans) "restructured their thinking in a new way."

All that would have been all right but the viewers who saw it were shocked by the "cost" of the mental restructuring. In a decree adopted after the broadcast the republic Council of Ministers notes: The leaders of the Palanga Gorispolkom under the pretext of increasing the qualifications of the management workers and specialists, used for their own purposes cooperative funds that were intended for the development of the city's social infrastructure and paid various organizations almost R160,000 [rubles].

Later an agreement was concluded with the Center for Recreational Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences, according to which the latter is obliged to conduct six psychological training sessions of 9-16 days each and advise the leaders and specialists of the city. This agreement cost the city R180,000. Incidentally, the leaders of the Palanga Gorispolkom also submitted their resignations.

But our discussion is not about particular incidents. It is about a situation in which a considerable number of the bureaucrats with power, apparently having decided that they have no chance of winning the forthcoming elections to the soviets, abandoned the remnants of elementary decency and began to make themselves rich. In Lithuania, where so far there have been no sensational trials of corrupt authorities, even these stories on a "local scale" produced a real shock.

How does a society protect itself from having public property squandered? How do we keep newly arrived merchants from getting rich at others' expense? What force will curb the appetites of the "former" leaders who are leaving the scene?

I should like very much to say: Wait for the elections. Let us wait until people come into power who have been elected in a truly democratic way, people who have the confidence of their constituents, people who are honorable and principled. They will create their teams in their own image and everything will be put in its proper place. And this will be the most natural path to purification.

But, as they say, the worst thing one can do is wait and catch up. Along with the procurators' offices, in my view, all healthy forces of the society must become more active—the deputies (who, alas, in many places have been fired and will not even go to the sessions), people's and workers' controllers, trade union activists, journalists, and the party aktiv. This is the only possible way to reduce losses caused by the looting of the departing bureaucracy.

Of course there is a danger here. On the road from Klaypeda to Vilnius the USSR people's deputies Z. Shlichite and V. Chyapas were attacked. The attempt to take the damning documents from them was unsuccessful. These were the people who showed the public that goods in short supply which should have been placed on the shelves were deliberately being concealed in Klaypeda at the trade bases. Well, the battle was obviously not going to be easy.

While this article was being prepared for the press the session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet created a commission to investigate the activity of the republic's trade minister, L. Ryauba. The deputies were suspicious about the generosity of the minister who divided up sets of furniture and automobiles among his closest friends. Naturally, he took care of himself as well: Recently he replaced his old Volga with a new one, acquired a set of Finnish furniture costing R14,000, and moved his entire family of four into a six-room apartment.

Lithuanian Provisional Party Briefs Newsmen

PM0301143790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jan 90 Second Edition p1

[V. Karyakina report under the rubric "Assessments, Opinions": "Who is to Blame; At a News Conference in Vilnius"]

[Text] ... When the floodlights had been turned off and the television had switched off its cameras, some of those present at the first official press conference of the Lithuanian Communist Party provisional Central Committee decided that there was no need to pull any punches. "How does the sacred land of Lithuania stomach you?"—coming straight to the point, but with a "polerantnaya" [meaning unknown] smile, this question was put to the secretaries of this provisional committee, M. Burokyavichyus, V. Kardamavichyus, Yu. Kuolyalis, and V. Shved. It was a kind of signal, which read "Give those who are not on our side a hard time!" The "accused" did not wish to stoop to a discussion conducted in this kind of tone.

It must be said that the actual fact that such a news conference had been organized in the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building—in its conference hall, to be precise—albeit rather stretching a point, nevertheless serves as a kind of response to the question often asked from the auditorium: Do you see any possibilities for cooperation between the two Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committees? The interviewees invariably said: "We do!"

This idea was emphasized in the introductory speech by Professor M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party provisional Central Committee, and the same thing said by another secretary of the new party organ, V. Shved: "We are against confrontation. We are against the way in which the will of people taking the CPSU stance is being suppressed. We Lithuanian Communists have the same common objective: to create a humane, flourishing society. But the distinguishing feature of the stand expressed by the provisional Central Committee is that we believe that this society can and must be created within the framework of the Soviet Union and on the basis of the CPSU platform on nationalities policy."

They are frequently accused of causing a split. "We went to the congress with the desire to avoid confrontation and consolidate Communists," Yu. Kuolyalis, secretary of the provisional Central Committee (on the CPSU platform), said. "However, when the congress adopted the decision on voting by name—in other words, every delegate was in fact obliged to sign in favor of a definite party—a split became inevitable. But every cloud has a silver lining: In this way we established who is who."

"You are known as the 'night party' which has no more than 2% of Lithuanian Communists as its members...."

"Even the conference delegates who defended the CPSU platform included 15% of Lithuanian communists—not just 2%. And I think that in the future their numbers will not be so small. But we are fundamentally opposed to the idea of dividing Communists on the basis of nationality," Professor M. Burokyavichyus said in answer to this question.

At this, their first news conference, members of the Lithuanian Communist Party provisional Central Committee said that they are going to play an active role in the republic's political, economic, social, and cultural life.

Vadim Medvedev's Visit to Vilnius Examined

LD0201134090 Vilnius GIMTASIS KRASTAS in Lithuanian No 49, 7-13 Dec 89 p 7

[Article by R. V.: "Inspector Has Departed. Are We To Await Sanctions?"]

[Text] **For 3 days, a long black automobile somewhat resembling a hearse roamed Vilnius. Vadim Medvedev, member of CPSU Central Committee Politburo, was**

carrying out the difficult task assigned him by the mighty center: He was attempting to convince Lithuanian Communists that they could not separate from the CPSU since that would be to everyone's detriment.

V. Medvedev brought the party members a letter from M. Gorbachev himself. Its contents were typical of Moscow—long and watery. Only toward the very end of the letter was it openly stated: "The reestablishment of an independent nation outside USSR's limits and the creation of a republic communist party, independent of the CPSU ... is impossible and it is impermissible for communists to divide themselves up, according to national and social views... Only in unison and only forward toward a humane, democratic, and thriving society!"

Are we regarded as imbeciles or are we simply being ridiculed? After all, we have already marched along, holding our little hands, toward that bright tomorrow, and the further we went, the farther it got away from us until it disappeared altogether. It appears, even the inspector sensed it within the depths of his heart, that if you are one of the annointed, you must earn your keep.

V. Medvedev took part in the CC [Central Committee] of the Lithuanian CP [Communist Party] Plenum and met with Vilnius delegates to the 20th Lithuanian CP Congress, who explained to him at the onset, through the lips of Professor R. Pavilionis, "it is illogical to belong to two parties concurrently." In brief, V. Medvedev (the inspector) gave his own account ("Lithuania was backward in the past," "The Germans caused a lot of harm in Lithuania," "Lithuanians themselves chose the path of socialism in 1940.") Lithuania's representatives (verifying ones) also gave their own account. One cannot quote them all. The demonstrators outside the Central Committee building were displaying the slogans: "Independence for Lithuania, Freedom for Lithuanian CP!" and "Lithuania Without Independence, Lithuanian CP Without Future!"

This battle of opposites was enlivened somewhat by the "unionists." Some were crying that the mass information media were seized by "counterrevolutionaries" (J. Gureckas), others that they had been dug in the trenches too long (S. Apanavicius), still others were blaming M. Gorbachev—things had been so quiet up to 1985....

Having been chastized by creators of Lithuania assembled at the Palace of Art, the inspector departed. Things are not even interesting—nothing has changed. Are we going to await sanctions or the congress?

Kaunas City Executive Committee Resigns

LD2812122989 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 Dec 89

[Text] The Kaunas City Executive Committee has resigned. Some time ago, resignation was demanded by a plenum of the City Committee of the Communist Party which said that the city bosses were neglectful of economic and social problems facing the city. In general since November municipal authorities were removed in three Lithuanian towns.

Sajudis Activist Cited on Relations With Communists

LD0501102990 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Coming up next there's a talk on the relations between the Lithuanian Communist Party and the reform movement Sajudis:

[Commentator] When the euphoria after the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party subsided the Lithuanian press, mostly of Sajudis, carried some articles explaining the stand taken by Sajudis movement towards the new Lithuanian Communist Party. According to the member of the Seimas Council, Professor of economics, Kazimieras Antanavicius, most of the Council members maintain that Sajudis has been and remains to be in opposition. But there are different views as to how Sajudis people, elected to the leading bodies of the Communist Party should act. All this will probably find expression in a special document passed this Saturday at the Seimas Council sitting. Romualdas Ozolas, an activist of Sajudis, says he will abide by any decision taken by Sajudis, even if he is faced with an alternative Sajudis (?other) party. At the same time we should mind that the Communist Party performs tasks set by Sajudis.

Romualdas Ozolas is confident that if elected Central Committee secretaries the Sajudis people should retire from the Seimas Council but as long as they are merely members of that political, consultative organ, their withdrawal is not necessary. Demands to leave the Council, Romualdas Ozolas believes, come from those who are hostile to the Communist Party. Such demands are not placed in respect of the leaders of Social Democrats, the Workers' Union, and the Green Party should contribute to the common cause. Of course, so far there are no reasons for trust. (?The setbacks suffered) in the face of the whole nation gives the party a chance to regain trust. On the other hand Romualdas Ozolas admits that the situation the Communist Party is in at the moment is extraordinary. Asked: "can you at once be in power and in opposition?", Romualdas Ozolas said that his situation proved it was possible. A kind of duality does occur against your will. But a sober look would reveal that it was the restructuring of the Lithuanian Communist Party that we were after. We have accomplished this and can no longer stand aloof. Just like before we shall engage in all forms of political activity until they coincide with the goals of Sajudis. Or we shall simply resign if the Central Committee, the Bureau, and the Party itself fail to attain their objectives. This will mean a step we made towards freedom. So, according to Romualdas Ozolas, the Sajudis leaders in the Central Committee and the Bureau mean opposition from inside though, so far, it has not been legalized in any organisational form or structure. But such a situation cannot last long as the

opinions will sooner or later differentiate. For the time being, says Romualdas Ozolas, there are no clashing views in the Central Committee Bureau.

The three ultimate goals of the Communist Party are as follows: the first, to bring legal actions against its members, political and criminal culprits; second, to reshuffle the government at all levels; and third, to effect market based economy. Confrontation will set in unless these tasks are performed. Let's hope that Sajudis will get aware that today the communists are working in tandem with Sajudis. In other words, the Communist Party is becoming a powerful potential within the Sajudis movement and should be used to the best advantage. The success of Sajudis will to a great extent depend on it. Yet the relations between the Party and Sajudis remain (?to be) very unstable, says Romualdas Ozolas.

In general the relations of Sajudis with other political parties should be flexible, friendly at points where historical aims are broadly similar or coincide, and strictly categorical where aims differ, even to a slightest degree. Sajudis will remain to be a moral suggestion with great potential to probe any new historical development. Saying this Romualdas Ozolas is confident that in the wake of elections to the supreme power bodies in Lithuania the new Sajudis whose birth we witness today will come into being. All newly elected people will have to quit Sajudis bodies to give way to young people. The former Sajudis people will assert themselves exceptionally in state power structures. They will have to take responsibility not as opposition but by their committed involvement. In this way a new oppostion will rise around them with a degree of radicality which is still a great problem today. This should concern all of us retiring today from active live in Sajudis.

Latvian Party Plenum Postponed Until Late January

LD0401155490 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Jan 90

[Text] The first steps of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party have been closely observed from Riga. Will Latvians be determined enough to follow the Lithuanian Communists? It all depends upon the Latvians themselves. Meanwhile the plenary session of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee has been postponed. It awaits further developments in Lithuania. Here is Martins Gravitis.

[Gravitis] (?Lithuanian) Communists are hitting the international headlines late last year, and I think they're going to be very much in the news frontline in the coming weeks as well. Their counterparts in Latvia are divided sharply on the question whether they should split from Moscow, from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. As heated debates continue between those divided on this question the party central committee in Riga has postponed its plenum which is now going to take place at the end of January, instead of 5 January as planned earlier.

Reformists here are demanding an extraordinary party congress of Latvian communists to be summoned early this year which could then decide, or choose, the status of the party.

Latvian Solidarity Movement With Lithuania Meets

LD0501114190 Riga Domestic in Latvian 1830 GMT 3 Jan 90

[Excerpts] A meeting organized by the newly-founded "Lithuania, the sister of Latvia" solidarity movement took place this afternoon in the courtyard of the Agricultural Academy Palace [in Jelgava].

Students, workers, and lecturers of higher education establishment and other people of Jelgava—approximately 1,500 participants—also took part in it. Those present were addressed by USSR People's Deputy Professor Ervids Grinovskis. [passage omitted] He expressed support to the Lithuanian people and to their independent communist party in the fight for their republic's independence. All those gathered agreed that without a free Lithuania there can be no free Latvia and Estonia. Participants at the meeting appealed to the Latvian people to be united with their neighbors, the Lithuanians, in the days of their difficult trials, and to express their support in telegrams and letters to be sent to Moscow and Lithuania.

Those who gathered also adopted an appeal to the participants at the January plenum of the Latvian Communist Party and sent a letter to Mikhail Gorbachev.

Latvian Supreme Soviet To View Ethnic Rights Bill

LD0401095290 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 4 Jan 89

[Text] Riga January 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina:

Soviet Latvia's Parliament is publishing a bill on the rights of ethnic groups. It will be discussed by all citizens of this Baltic republic, the population of which consists of Latvians (52%), as well as of Russians, Belorussians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians and other ethnic groups.

The bill states that Latvian citizens, irrespective of their nationality, have equal political, economic and social rights. Any insult of national feelings is forbidden.

One of the bill's articles declares that it is the duty of ethnic groups to protect the interests of the Latvian people, that is all the republic's citizens.

At the same time there are differing opinions between the indigenous and non-Latvian population concerning Latvia's withdrawal from the USSR.

According to a sociological study by the cost-accounting agency Socionis conducted among 1,073 Riga residents, this idea is backed by 57.4% of Latvians and is rejected by 69.8% of non-Latvians.

Most non-Latvians wrote in the questionnaire that Latvia's withdrawal from the USSR would decrease the supplies of consumer goods, electricity and fuel. The withdrawal will entail a lower purchasing capacity, unemployment and a drop in housing construction.

Over three-quarters of respondents believe that the non-indigenous part of the population will have difficulties acquiring education.

The questionnaire asked respondents to express their attitude to the Popular Front's opinion: "The Latvian people should shoulder the moral responsibility for the development of ethnic groups' cultures".

As many as 68% of those polled disagreed with this thesis. They believe that guarantees should be determined by legal and economic rules rather than by moral obligations. In addition, they see in this thesis "the big brother" attitude.

Two-thirds of respondents were sure that an independent state would be authoritarian-nationalistic in character.

If it is established, 19.6% of non-Latvians intend to leave for the USSR voluntarily, 4.8—to emigrate to other countries and 42.3% will try to preserve Soviet citizenship. The rest did not reply to this question.

Estonian Party Plenum Resumes Deliberations

LD0501004390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Jan 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent H. Lenk, introduced by announcer I. Kudrin, with recorded interview with M. Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] [Kudrin] All news received from the Baltic capitals arouses our special, heightened interest today. The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum continued its work in Tallinn today after a break of almost 1 month.

[Lenk] Estonian Commnists must today work practically under the conditions of a multiparty system. About 20 different political movements are functioning in the republic. Or as Vaino Valjas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist party Central Committee said in his speech, the competition between different ideas characterizes the political climate in the republic. This is why Estonian Communists need to define the role of their party under the new conditions.

[Titma] Until now we have fulfilled three functions. First, we implemented power; real changes occurred in the republic via the party and the party to a certain extent amortized tendencies to the right and to the left, acceleratory ones and those which in general were restraining the process of perestroyka. The second function is, indisputably, that of a bridge between the Estonians as the indigenous nation and the Russian community—although we also have many other nationalities. The third function is that of a link with Moscow. It must be said that at this plenum conversation resolved around precisely this latter function—our ties with Moscow.

The party is now being put in a very difficult position because in the country as a whole the process of perestroyka is moving very slowly and our republic is small and the processes are progressing very rapidly, fast—we could move much faster than other republics. This is what causes difficulties in our interaction with the central bodies. Here we have one rule. It is clear that we are in Gorbachev's team as far as perestroyka is concerned and we see that it is only with this team in Moscow that we implement perestroyka in Estonia. On the other hand we represent the Estonian people and their interests. From this definite discussions and disputes arise from our side even with Gorbachev's team and we must stand up for the interests of our own people, for party members who do not place these interests at the center of their activities lose the trust of the people and as a result power and the opportunity to participate in events.

Supports Lithuanian Independence

LD0501105890 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 5 Jan 90

[Text] News has reached us from Tallinn today that the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum is in progress there. A letter expressing support for the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party was sent to the CPSU Central Committee by the members of the plenum.

Decides on Candidates, Meetings

LD0401164290 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1500 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] [Announcer] The 16th Plenum of the Communist Party [CP] of Estonia Central Committee, which was suspended last year on 7 December, continued in Tallinn today. Of the 135 Central Committee members, 107 are taking part in the work of the plenum; of the 69 Central Committee candidate members, 59; and of the 39 Editing Commission members, 28 are taking part.

On today's agenda were the report of Vayno Vyalyas, first secretary of CP of Estonia Central Committee, on events which have taken place after the plenum was suspended; a report of the Editing Commission, which will be presented by Arder Vali, and information from the commission on legislative initiative, which will be presented by Mikk Tiitma. Also on the agenda was the endorsement of the commission on preparations for the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Estonia. Also the fundamental resolutions of the Communist Party of Estonia commissions will be endorsed. Organizational questions are also on the agenda.

Before Vayno Vyalyas was given the floor, Toomas Leito came to the rostrum. He proposed to respect Academician Andrey Sakharov, who died between the two sessions of the plenum, with 1 minute's silence.

Vayno Vyalyas, first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, noted that its 16th plenum is taking place at a very intense period. Fitting into its suspension period were a whole string of events of general political importance which influenced preparations for the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Estonia. Among other events, Comrade Vyalyas mentioned the local elections to Estonian SSR soviets and the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which took place in Moscow.

The plenum decided to nominate on the part of the Communist Party of Estonia Comrades Vayno Vyalyas, Indrek Toome [chairman of the Council of Ministers], and Arnold Ruutel [chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet] for the Supreme Soviet elections.

The plenum also decided to convene a party conference on 9 February to prepare for the regular 20th party congress, which will be held on 23 March.

The work of the plenum continues.

Vyalyas Address

LD0401113790 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1000 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] An hour ago the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee plenum in Tallinn resumed its work. Vayno Vyalyas spoke today. He highlighted the complexity of the present situation in Estonia and the position of the Communist Party of Estonia in this regard. He pointed out a sad truth: Within the all-union daily conscience a simplified understanding, alas, reigns in respect of the USSR state structure and in respect of the unity of the CPSU, for objective reasons. The unity of the whole society, its similarity, the same understanding of the aims are considered to be the main preconditions for development. On the basis of those false understandings, local interests and characteristics of the Communist Party are equated with nationalism and separatism. Experience demonstrates that in different USSR regions the experience of development is different, as are national traditions and national consciousness. Religious beliefs and customs are different, the level of development and public consciousness are different. These special features force local party bodies to consider local interests in their policy. The logical outcome of taking this into account is on some occasions also the adoption of such resolutions whose necessity is not always understood by the all-union central bodies and also by all-union public opinion. Arising from the above is the fact that it is possible to develop the restructuring process and democratization in the Soviet Union only if the all-union management takes into account the special features of different regions and hands down to localities the right to decide and also responsibility for the results.

Vayno Vyalyas pointed out the fact that in the localities, communists face a difficult choice: Either begin with their own people a public struggle against the centrist management or oppose the endeavors of their own people. To play the role of a two-timer here is not possible. The people ask straight: Who are you with, communists? It seems that a critical time for this question arrived in Lithuania, Veyno Vyalyas noted at the beginning of the speech.

What should the Communist Party of Estonia do? This direction is awaited from today's plenum of the full complement of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee. It is being awaited by the Communist Party of Estonia, and also by the people listening to the relay from here, from the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee building. In the present conditions, the Communist Party of Estonia regards its mission as the safeguarding of the transfer to a democratic society. Such an aim will be achieved at the cost of its present place and status, noted Vayno Vyalyas. I think that this should become a redemption of the chief political debt on the part of the Communist Party of Estonia, it being the organization with which rests responsibility for the development of society. We propose that a Supreme Soviet session set up a corresponding commission to ensure Estonian state sovereignty, made up of USSR and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet deputies. Its duty would be to draw up an action plan in order to bring our state's status in line with the endeavors for sovereignty and to restore Estonia to being subject to its internal law.

Those thoughts were set out today by Vayno Vyalyas at the plenum. But he also spoke about a very important tendency which at the moment is prevalent within the party—that is discontinuing party membership. Thus, in 1989 about 41,000 people left the party, which is over 80% of all those who relinquished their party membership card in the Estonian [SSR]. The nationality factor is not at play here. If during the first half of the year rural people were in a slight majority, then during the second half it has been urban people. The Estonians who during 1989 left the party totalled about 51%. Why is membership being discontinued? This is an essential question? Vayno Vyalyas pointed to the following reasons: First, serious dissatisfaction with the crisis situation within our society; lack of both individuality, of decision-making power, and of a fighting spirit within party organizations. Neither the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee not town and rayon party committees have succeeded in making an exhaustive analysis and providing explanations to party members who find themselves confused.

Today's report by Vayno Vyalyas was analytical. It suggested a chief direction for action. Now speeches have started on the basis of the report. At the moment, Jaak Allik is at the rostrum.

TASS Report

LD0401174590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Tallinn, 4 Jan (ETA-TASS)—Vayno Vyalyas, communist leader of the Soviet Baltic Republic of Estonia, stated today that if the CPSU were structured on the principle of the independence of the republics' communist parties, this would guarantee the independence of the Estonian Communist Party. Speaking at a plenum of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, he also emphasized that "the Lithuanian Communist Party's path to independence cannot serve as a direct example for the reformation of the Estonian Communist Party."

The first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee delivered a report at the plenum, which debated the place and role of the party in the republic's political life.

The report notes that during the month-long break in the work of the plenum, many events of general political importance have occurred, incluencing to one degree or another the preparations for the 20th Congress of the Estonian Communist Party slated for March of this year. Local soviet elections and the Second Congress of People's Deputies have been held, preparations have begun for the election of a new Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic, etc.

The rapporteur emphasized that for the Estonian Communist Party, as for many democratic movements, the principal aim remains a sovereign and democratic Estonia. The Communist Party sees its basic mission in today's conditions as ensuring the transition to a democratic society.

Ideological fissures have become clearly evident among us, said Vayno Vyalyas. Extreme positions do not fit into the framework of a single party, irrespective of whether it should be part of the CPSU or independent. Some communists wish to construct socialism by the canons of the traditional theory of communism, without any substantial revision of its foundations. Others are basing themselves on the experience of international social democracy.

Vayno Vyalyas noted that at the March congress of the Communist Party of Estonia, political course and status are to be confirmed. The independence of the Communist Party of Estonia must not, however, mean losing political allies either inside or outside the republic, he stressed.

Plenum Ends

LD0401215490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2100 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum has ended in Tallinn. At the plenum, issues relating to the political situation in the republic after the extraordinary plenum of the CPSU Central Committee were discussed. Valjas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the plenum. A political declaration was adopted in which an appraisal of the activities of the republican party organization was given and specific approaches to work under the new conditions were set out. It was decided to hold the next, the 20th, Congress of the Estonian Communist Party on 23 March this year, after the elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet have taken place.

Titma Views Plenum's Work

LD0401214590 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Correspondent Gunnar Paal report]

[Excerpts] Today's Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum demonstrated once again that political aspirations are ablaze, that there are great differences between the understandings within the membership of one party which exclude the possibility of achieving concord. [passage omitted]

What was it that today's plenum provided for our scale of understanding? Mikk Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee:

[Begin Titma recording] A kind of necessary self-acknowledgement took place. It simply became clear that one cannot force indeed completely different political platforms upon the other side; it is impossible. This old monstrosity of a kind, the party-state apparatus, which previously ruled the whole society, right? This is what we are presently dismantling, but a section of the people still is behaving according to the self-same principle that if they now could get hold of the head then they could force upon everybody their political platform. It emerged at the plenum, however, that the political platforms are so different; together in this way, that one must begin to make it clear to oneself with whom it is possible to achieve a compromise and act (?all together), and with whom one has to draw a clear line. That does not mean that, figuratively speaking, those people must be viewed as having gone back on their faith, so to speak; no. A political party must become not a religious sect in the future, but an association of people who are engaged in real politics, who have joined together on a certain, fairly wide platform, but if the platform turns out to be of the kind on which it is not possible for everybody to act together—and this picture is very clear to us today—then one will have to clearly bring out the platforms, examine their true force, and then formulate the issue organizationally. At the moment, however, a section of the people have this kind of an understanding that if one succeeds in sending more delegates to the party congresss now, in taking the leading bodies upon oneselves, then figuratively speaking, one many succeed in laying one's hands on the party. No, one would not succeed; the party would simply break up, and that is it. [passage omitted]

The plenum adopted a political statement the text of which will be published in the press. [end recording]

Unpopular Economic Measures Adopted in Estonia

PM0301165390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent L. Levitskiy dispatch under the rubric "Sessions of Union Republic Supreme Soviets": "But Prices Went Up Nonetheless"]

[Text] Tallinn—The 13th session of Estonia's Supreme Soviet ended only after 3 months of work. Its unusual standing orders resulted from the need to succeed in fully elaborating and adopting by the new year a package of laws making it possible to implement the concept of autonomous economic management from its very first days. It must be said that the government successfully managed to prepare, and legislators to adopt (even if only after lengthy heated arguments) many documents and legal acts defining the essence of the new economic policy in the republic.

Of course, time alone will tell how effective the new radical ideas will be. The shared desire—to live calmly and to have enough—will probably not materialize immediately or even soon. If forecasts are really correct, and for the future's sake, the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic government and the republic's Supreme Soviet will today have to adopt decisions which may not be the most popular among the people.

An example is provided by the discussion of the draft 1990 budget. It was proposed to increase prices of alcoholic beverages by 20%, of tobacco products by 50%, and of beer by 100%. These are the "tough yarns" the government is trying to use to darn the hole in the republic's budget—a deficit of R150 million.

Following the first day of debate, deputies' commissions worked until late in the evening seeking compromise amendments to the budget which would make it possible to garner the necessary majority of votes to adopt this decision. This was successfully achieved on the second day of the session's work. The budget was ratified. The funds received as a result of higher prices are earmarked for use to increase the wages of workers in the social and cultural sphere, student grants, and pensioners' allowances. Prices of alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, and beer will be increased as of 8 January, following the celebration of Christmas according to the old calendar. The government was instructed to elaborate proposals by 1 March for raising purchase prices for agricultural produce. According to members of Estonia's government, food prices are expected to rise in the new year.

Following the sharp debate on the budget, the other documents were adopted much more calmly. Deputies ratified a new taxation system and a Law on Banks. An autonomous bank will start functioning in Estonia next year, vested will full powers including the right to issue its own money.

Titma Discusses Estonian Komsomol Affairs

[Speech given by Mikk Titma, Secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Centeral Committee, at the 21st Estonian Komsomol Congress, which took place 24-24 November—date and place of speech not given]

90UN0506A Tallinn MOLODIZH ESTONII in Russian 28 Nov 89 p 1

[Text] I was, it is true, intending to speak later, but a meeting of the Estonian Workforce Council is beginning now in parallel, and I will have to be there as well. I will, therefore, try to now express certain thoughts which arose yesterday at the congress. I have to begin by saying that, generally, yesterday made quite a sad impression on me. You have spoken a good deal about things in respect of which the speakers lacked backing in the form of knowledge and which are of very little interest to young people. Youth problems and the interests of the youth, which now and—I venture to assert this with full confidence—in the immediate future, in the next 5 years, for longer, perhaps, will be very serious under the conditions of IME [self-managing Estonia], you have essentially not as yet examined at all. In this sense entangling the congress in procedural issues and the discussion of matters in respect of which there is a lack of elementary knowledge, just like all that has been said concerning the Estonian Republic, and the legal debate were absolutely absurd. A public organization and the state cannot in all seriousness be juxtaposed. A public organization may make merely political decisions, and legal relations arise merely with state authorities and other organizations. Now, if we adopt a principled approach to what you are now doing, you are, of course, preparing a very important decision of a fundamental nature, which concerns one part of a totalitarian system, which the Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] has been up to the present time, in which it has tried to perform manifestly a single function—encompassing the whole younger generation and thereby ensuring its loyalty in respect of the ruling order. Such an all-embracing youth organization is typical only under the conditions of a monopoly of autocracy, and in no democratic state is more than 2% or 3% of the youth politicized. Consequently, there will necessarily in reality in the future in Estonia be many social and political youth groups, but there will be no such giant as the Komsomol has hitherto been. In this sense your aspiration to dismantle this all-embracing mechanism is entirely clear and understandable, this should be done, and it is natural that the Komsomol in this form is disintegrating. Now, if we further examine the question as to what will happen then, I would like to say one thing. Such a decision as that the LKSME [Estonian Leninist Communist Youth League] will officially be dissolved may, of course, be sought today. Such a decision may be sought, such a decision may even be adopted at the congress. There is not in this decision as such any limiting influence on what 10 persons who say that they are the LKSME intend to do. Consequently, in any event, regardless of the congress' decision, there could be a continuation. In this sense it is wrong to

imagine that there may now no longer be in Estonia a youth organization with a socialist orientation. This cannot be prevented. In addition, I would make so bold as to maintain that even in the university a youth movement of a socialist orientation will unfailingly emerge, this is bound to happen. There is no university in the world which does not have a youth movement with such an orientation. And there is bound to be such. That, unfortunately—and here we are in agreement—your generation has been unable now to make constructive use of the organizational possibilities which have existed in the shape of the structure and resources of the Komsomol in the interests of the youth cause is another matter. It is wrong to portray matters such that this was not possible. I would make so bold as to say on the basis of my own practice that this could have been done in the very difficult times of stagnation also, and the Komsomol organization of Tartu University in the 1960's still tackled in earnest questions which were of interest to the students and made use of all these resources to this end. The university Komsomol even opposed the party and entered into open conflict. Today I also would like to say that it is necessary to think very clearly about the future. It is very easy to simply eliminate all these structures. But it is very difficult building new structures and beginning, through them, to fight for the young people's rights. Anticipating the current situation, the republic's leadership envisaged in principle the path of development, that we would be moving toward the creation of a state youth service. Of course, it will not under the conditions of IME be possible to allocate for young people very much in the way of resources since life will be very severe and difficult. Many people are talking about a market economy, but do not understand that life will be completely different under the conditions of a market economy. It will be suffused with struggle for one's own existence. This will not be the inert life which, for example, it has been possible to live hitherto in the Komsomol apparatus. For this reason I would like to end with the following appeal to you.

You are now making a political decision. Be above the fact here that the Komsomol is not currently in fashion. It is very easy now kicking what you were in. No one forced you to join, the majority of you took this step under the conditions of the system unawares—I agree. But you bound yourselves to this and in making such a negative evaluation of what was done you need to understand that this is a command of the current moment and that you will gain no great authority and win no big victory by this. But if we now look ahead, we have to give some thought to the fact that all these steps will determine Estonia's future, also. We should make way for this future democratically and tranquilly. We cannot eliminate the possibility of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Union having its detachment emerge in Estonia, we cannot prevent the emergence of any youth organization of a socialist orientation. Let these possibilities be open on the basis of your organization and let the young people who wish to continue do so. Let us be responsible in the sense also of not making political and moral decisions for others but of deciding only in respect of ourselves.

Youth Daily Rounds up Estonian Political News

PM2212155589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 89 p 1

[Tallinn correspondent Galina Sapozhnikova dispatch: "Estonia: The Week's Political News"]

[Text] The Journalists' Information Center, jointly with the Sociology Institute, conducted the latest telephone poll dealing with the Second Congress of People's Deputies.

The results of the previous poll, conducted before the Congress, were surprising: People in Tallinn were highly pessimistic in their appraisals of perestroyka, the changes in the country, and the Supreme Soviet's activity, with non-Estonians much more so than Estonians. Here is one result of yesterday's poll:

—The work of the Congress is proceeding democratically (or "more or less democratically"), according to 41% of Estonians, 68% of non-Estonians, and 36% of rural residents.
—The opposite opinion is held by 47% of Estonians, 13% of non-Estonians, and 41% of rural residents.

Commenting these and other data, Andrus Saar, director of the Journalists' Information Center, draws the following conclusion: "Those who believe that the Congress is working democratically are supporters of the economy's centralization. The hopes they had placed in the Congress are the ones which materialized most of all and, to give them their due, they are—in comparison with others—best informed of what is happening at the Congress. They are constantly following its work and are basically familiar with Ryzhkov's report. This is perfectly natural, since this group of people polled contained the largest number of elderly persons. But there are also young people among them."

A regular sitting of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session was held 15 December which, in addition to a package of laws, adopted two important resolutions. The first is on amendments to Articles 6 and 7 of the Estonian SSR Constitution (this proposal has been submitted for nationwide discussion until 8 January 1990). The second is on the creation of a Bank of Estonia which, in the foreseeable future, will determine the exchange rate of the national currency in relation to Soviet money and the money of foreign states.

In compliance with the Estonian SSR Law on "Fundamentals of Economic Accountability in the Estonian SSR," the republic's Council of Ministers announced a competition for the best designs for Estonian bank notes and coins. The competition rules give the names of the monetary units—"krona" and "cent." Prizes will be awarded to the winners. In rubles, for the time being.

The Fourth Forum of Estonian's Independent Youth was held in Tallinn 16 December. Compared with the previous forums, the current one failed to bring together a large number of participants—young people have lost their interest in politics. This time, the forum did not display unity, either—its participants, suspecting each other of "links" with the Communist Youth League [Komsomol] and having argued for 10 hours on end—arrived at virtually no agreement at all.

The most serious youth grouping represented at the forum was "Geneva-49." Under the pretext that Estonia was occupied in 1940, the movement's leaders call on Estonian teenagers to boycott service in the "occupation" forces, in other words the Soviet Army. And they are successful—kilograms of military identity cards and draft papers are being mailed to the republican military commissariat from some of Estonia's rayons.

The "Geneva-49" grouping proposed at the forum that the Estonian Komsomol should "rehabilitate itself in the public's eyes" and, exercising its power to initiate legislation, should submit to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet a proposal to repeal the Estonian SSR Constitution's article about service in the Soviet Army.

Ayvar Rauam, first secretary of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee, promised to set up a commission to look into this question.

The first plenum of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee since the 21st republican Komsomol congress was held 14 December, and it examined current questions about the status and standing orders of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee, the powers of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee Secretariat during the transitional period, and the deadlines for publication of draft program and statute documents proposed by action groups. The resolutions which were adopted notified Central Committee members of the last day of their powers—25 May 1990, while the Secretariat reserved the right to decide the future of Komsomol property and to set up working commissions concerning the status of press organs, the "Sputnik" International Youth Tourism Bureau, the Youth Organizations Committee, and so on.

The week's most popular topic discussed in the local press was a map of "Europe in the year 2000, as seen through the eyes of the British," published by the British newspaper THE INDEPENDENT and reprinted by Estonian newspapers.

Archbishop Kirill on West Ukraine Developments

LD2712233889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] In Moscow today there was a press conference devoted to the recent development in the religious situation in the western oblasts of the Ukraine. [passage omitted]

The Russian Orthodox Church has taken a number of steps to normalize the situation, but they have not eased the tension. Speaking of necessary measures, Archbishop Kirill, chairman of the External Church Relations Department of the Moscow Patriarchate, said:

[Begin Kirill recording] In order to normalize the situation there is a need first for the immediate creation of the necessary prerequisites for such a normalization. Such a prerequisite is a halt to the violence.

Second, it is necessary to begin a dialogue with the Catholic Church, and I am pleased to announce that such talks will take place in Moscow 13-17 January between representatives of the Vatican and the Russian Orthodox Church.

Third, in speaking about the prospects of a normalization we should proceed on the basis of one very fundamental point. In the Soviet Union the rights of people should be satisfied and religious freedom should be given effect on the basis of those laws that exist in our society. It is important that an opportunity be given to register communities and to form communities so that people may normally organize their religious life. As for the issue of the use of various premises and various religious buildings this matter too should be resolved on the basis of the law, in an amicable and open atmosphere and within the framework of a dialogue between the two churches. [end recording]

Language Study Conference Held in Ukraine

90UN0402A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 19 Nov 89 p 2

[Report by RATAU correspondent: "At the Center of Attention—the Ukrainian Language"]

[Text] "Ways of raising the effectiveness of learning Ukrainian language and literature in schools and vocational-technical schools" was the theme of a four day republic-level scientific-practical conference which took place in the Cherkassy Oblast. It was organized by the Ukrainian SSR [Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic] Ministry of Education, the leadership of the Ukrainian writers union, the T.G. Shevchenko Ukrainian language society, A.A. Potebnya Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences linguistics institute, T.G. Shevchenko Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences institute of literature, and the Ukrainian SSR pedagogical scientific research institute.

It was noted at the conference that the teaching of Ukrainian language and literature is closely related to the restoration of the prestige of the Ukrainian language, and the filling in of "blank spots" in the literature courses. Great hope for positive changes in relation to

the language and its study in schools and other educational-training institutions is tied to the law recently passed by the Supreme Soviet of the republic on languages in the Ukrainian SSR in which Ukrainian was given the status of official language of the government.

In the opinion of conference participants, a coordinating center under the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Education must be established on problems of teaching Ukrainian literature in schools, middle schools, technical institutes and institutions of higher learning. This center would consist of teacher-innovators, scientists, writers, composers, artists, actors, representatives of cultural institutions. A series of concrete recommendations were made among which was one to give a partiotic and international education to students of belles lettres based on native literature, literature of the USSR peoples, and foreign literature.

Participants in the conference looked over an exhibit reflecting the teaching experience of teachers of Ukrainian language and literature in school and vocational-technical institutes of the republic.

The conference was addressed by the Ukrainian SSR Minister of Education M.V. Fomenko, secretary of the board of Writers' Union of Ukraine, representative of the T.G. Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society, and USSR People's Deputy D.V.Pavlichko.

Responsible workers of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party and Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers took part in the work of the conference.

Ukrainian Official Cited on Greek Catholics

PM2812150589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "State and Church: Harmonization of Relations"]

[Text] Kiev—In the past 2 years the number of religious associations in the Ukraine has increased 40 percent. The newly created associations of believers have been presented with about 2,000 religious buildings which formerly lay empty or were being used for other purposes and assistance is being given in constructing new churches. New monasteries and religious educational establishments have been opened and church newspapers have appeared. Believers are being better provided with religious literature published both in the USSR and abroad.

Reporting these facts to a TASS correspondent, Nikolay Kolesnik, chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers Council for Religious Affairs, stressed that "the changes which are taking place are an inalienable component of the perestroyka which is being pursued at the CPSU's initiative, of democratization, and of the humanization of all spheres of life and of the activity of Soviet society, including perestroyka in relations between the state and church organizations."

At the same time he admitted that there are also some difficulties. The recently published statement of the republican Council for Religious Affairs pointed out that the Eastern Greek Catholics (uniates), when forming religious communities, can, like representatives of other faiths, register them within the established procedure and decide the question of the venue for prayer meetings. The only thing required of believers is observance of the Constitution and legislation on cults.

The local soviet of people's deputies executive committees have already begun to receive applications for the registration of such religious communities. But in some places "rights defenders" close to the church have demanded that the state, before registering Greek Catholic communities, should recognize as invalid the decisions of the 1946 Lvov church synod on the self dissolution of the Greek Catholic church and "rehabilitate" it.

Any unprejudiced person, the chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs stressed, can see the absurdity of this ultimatum and can see the desire to maintain tension in the religious situation. First, the Soviet state has no right to interfere and will not interfere in internal church matters, including the deeds of church synods. Second, it is possible and necessary to investigate human destinies and to rehabilitate those ministers of religion who suffered innocently in the past (incidentally, this work is under way). But how can one raise the question of rehabilitating a church which, as a religious institution, was never subjected to criminal persecution?

As Eastern Greek Catholic religious communities begin to be created and receive official status, the chairman said, the local soviets of people's deputies will help them in acquiring the necessary material base—they will hand over for use free and vacated religious buildings and render assistance in constructing new churches. It is proposed that these questions be resolved depending on local potential, taking into account the interests of other existing religious societies.

Arbitrariness, forcible seizure, and other methods of struggling for the use of churches are absolutely intolerable from the viewpoint of state laws and from the positions of christianity, Nikolay Kolesnik said. That is why criminal proceedings have been instituted over the case of the arbitrary invasion of a group of Eastern Greek Catholics into the Preobrazhenskiy church in Lvov, depriving the orthodox congregation which operated there of the opportunity to exercise its religion.

Belorussia To Pay Chernobyl Allowance

PM0501111990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent M. Shimanskiy report: "Allowance for Inhabitants of Chernobyl Zone"]

[Text] Minsk—The state will pay a monetary allowance of R15 per month for each family member to the inhabitants of 1,524 population centers, including 7 Belorussian cities, subjected to radioactive pollution as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station. This decision has been adopted by the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers.

What gave rise to it? I put this question to V. Buryak, deputy administrator of affairs of the republic Council of Ministers.

"Hitherto an allowance of R30 a month per family member was paid to the inhabitants of only those population centers where the contamination rate stood at 15 curies or more per square kilometer.

"In accordance with decisions adopted by the union government earlier, a limit has been imposed on the consumption of locally produced foodstuffs in those places. It is a question primarily of milk and vegetables from country dwellers' homesteads. These products are 2-3 times more dirtier than those produced in the state sector.

"Additional research has been conducted in rayons subjected to radioactive pollution. What has it shown? People living there must limit their consumption of milk and other locally produced polluted foodstuffs. In order to somehow lighten the material costs which the inhabitants of these rayons have to bear as a consequence of this decision, the Belorussian Government submitted a proposal to the union organs to pay a monetary allowance. The USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions supported the republic's proposal. The allowance is already being paid. It will total more than R86 million a year. It will go to 480,000 people living not only in Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts but also in Brest, Minsk, and Grodno Oblasts. They are inhabitants of hamlets and villages, as well as the rayon centers of Bykhov, Slavgorod, Krasnopolye, Cherikov, Khoyniki, Yelsk, and Dobrush. This list will be defined more precisely every year and, if the need arises, it will be extended.

"The Chernobyl disaster which befell Belorussia is not receding. People living on the sick land require daily special attention and all-around support. It was this that dictated the republic government's decision."

Press Conference on Chernobyl Held in Belorussia

90UN0409A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 18 Nov 89 pp 3-4

[Article by L. Peresypkin, Ye. Gorelik, and D. Patyko, BELTA correspondents: "A Time of Difficult Work"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a press conference for workers in the mass media was held in Minsk in the republic's press center on the subject: "Program for eliminating the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] and ways to implement it."

Starting the account with it, we would like to remind the reader that it was only after the second reading, after detailed additional work, that a long-range state program was adopted at a recent session of the BSSR [Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic]. The program represents the collective labor of many people and, first and foremost, of residents of the stricken zones, party and soviet workers, officials of republic ministries and departments, scientists, and representatives of social organizations. It was preceded by specific actions in the resettlement and provision of food for the people, their treatment and recovery, the construction of new settlements, the decontamination of contaminated territories, and, finally, the development of a concept for safe living, taking into account medical and social considerations.

A commission of the Bureau of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the BSSR Council of Ministers, which was established last year, coordinated all of the work. Its representative, V.G. Yevtukh, the first deputy secretary of the Council of Ministers of the republic, after briefly informing those in attendance about the main provisions of the program, emphasized: "The elimination of the aftereffects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES is the main task that has to be resolved in the near future by the party organization of Belorussia, the newly elected parliament of the republic, and by all of the Belorussian people."

"About R17 billion will be required to resettle people in newly built settlements; to set up living conditions, nourishment, and medical services; to introduce supplements for pay and general compulsory education on radiation protection; to pay compensation in connection with property lost in moving, and to perform a large amount of work to lower radiation contamination—briefly, to put all of the above into effect."

The program was submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet with the hope that it will be approved and will become the law for all departments and organizations of the country. But, not waiting for a decision of the union parliament, the republic has started to implement the program. Today, in this way, the first harvest of successes and disappointments has already been gathered.

This is what A.T. Kichkaylo, deputy chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers, told the journalists.

In the new year, construction organizations of the republic will be freed from conducting work in Western Siberia, the non-chernozem zone of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], and on BAM [Baykal-Amur main rail line]. True, we have not yet received support for our repeated requests for the return to the republic of Belorussian builders from Armenia, where about 2,000 persons are working who are well supplied with equipment and excellent materials.

In addition, our government has submitted a proposal to USSR Gosplan [State Planing Committee] to reduce the volume of construction of industrial installations in the sum of R300 million in order to bring specialists and equipment engaged there to implement the program for eliminating the aftereffects of the accident. USSR Gosplan's concurrence has been received. As a result, in 1990 the building program in industry on the whole in the republic will increase by only 1.2 percent, and all of the freed-up capacity will be directed at the erection of housing and cultural and communal facilities in the stricken rayons.

The well-known association "Polesyevodstroy" [forest and water resources construction] will be reprofiled and will concentrate its efforts on the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident with an increase in the volume of operations in the 13th 5-Year Plan by almost a factor of two. Moreover, in 1990 the collective will perform exclusively building work in the sum of R100 million.

Also supported was the proposal to transfer construction-assembly organizations of the USSR Minatomenergoprom [Ministry of Machine Building for the Nuclear Power Industry] from the Ignalinskiy AES to Mogilev Oblast, with the subsequent creation there of a strong building base for the annual fulfillment of work in the sum of R120-150 million.

The USSR Council of Ministers granted the right to the BSSR Council of Ministers to involve all construction organizations located on the territory of the republic in the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident without getting the concurrence of pertinent union ministries and departments. USSR Gosplan gave its approval to invite Polish builders to the republic starting in 1990. To the extent that draft estimate documentation is ready, they will be included in the work and will provide "turnkey" facilities. All of this is being done in order to be able to cope with the task in 1990 and to double the volume of construction for the resettlement of people in 1991.

The state gas concern "Gazprom" and the USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises have been instructed, beginning this year, to lay a gasline from Torzhok to Dolina, with pipeline extensions from it to populated points located in radioactively contaminated rayons. In 1990, a sector of the Slavgorod-Rechitsa gas pipeline with appropriate extensions will be put into operation. Simultaneously, a distribution system will be built in populated areas whose resettlement is not covered in the program. The necessary resources and funds have been allocated for this.

All-told in 1990, for the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident, capital investments have been allocated in the sum of R700 million, including R450 million for construction assembly work. This is almost three times more than will be assimilated this year.

It is planned to spend R121 million on the construction of hospitals and outpatient clinics, and more than R71 million on the construction of schools and children's pre-school establishments and cultural facilities.

As is known, the state program provides for the resettlement in 1990-1991 of people from 112 populated localities in which the total radiation dosage can reach 35 rems and more, and also from territories where the density of contamination exceeds 40 Ci/km2. For this it is necessary to build 10,000 homes of the farmstead type. Plots have already been selected for the new settlements on clean territory. We note that it is planned to build 22 of them in Mogilev Oblast and 24 in Gomel Oblast. Drafting is now in full swing.

There is confidence that by 1990 an additional 4,000 assembled panel houses will be erected in the republic. Hundreds of thousands of tonnes of oil bitumen and asphalt, cement, steel pipes, and metal sheeting have been allocated for the conduct of building operations above the plans for delivery in 1990. Also allocated are a thousand trucks, 70 excavators and bulldozers, graders, asphalt plants, asphalt spreaders, loading equipment, and other equipment.

A.T. Kichkaylo explained in detail what units have to be built in Mogilev Oblast in what periods, and he named the specific executors of the work. The same kind of a detailed program will be approved for Mogilev Oblast in the next few days.

He also talked about the benefits established by a recent decree of the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] "Concerning Additional Measures to Intensify the Protection of Health and Improve the Material Condition of the Population Which Was Exposed to Radioactive Contamination as a Result of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES." (The decree was published in the press.)

As at many previous meetings, particular attention of the participants at the conference was devoted to the problems of the protection of the health of people. It was noted that a system of medical, agricultural improvement, and decontamination measures conducted in the stricken areas made it possible to lower the radiation dosage of the thyroid glands of the population by a factor of 5-10, the dosage of outer radiation by a factor of 2.5, and internal radiation by a factor of 10-15.

The total radiation dosage of the residents of the rayons under "strict" control in the years 1986-1988 on the average constituted about 5.9 rem, on territories with a density contamination of cesium of more than 40 Ci/km [superior] 2 [reset]—9 rem, and for the remainder of the territories—less than 3.4 rem, it was reported by V.S. Ulashchik, the BSSR minister of health. Consequently, the minister believes that the real radiation dosages are substantially lower than the norms established after the accident (15.5 rem for the indicated period). The average radiation dosage for 1988 is 0.76 rem. However, in individual populated centers, it was reaching the danger

level (Lomachi, Khoynikskiy, Osipovka, and Shepetovichskiye Poplavy of the Checherskiy Rayon, Bartolomeyevka of the Vetkovskiy Rayon, Chudyany of the Cherikovskiy Rayon, and others. Therefore, local delays in the resettlement of the residents is not understandable.

Clinical observation and the creation of an all-union distribution register are taken as the basis for preventive treatment work among the population that has been exposed to radiation. Information is recorded in it on 173,400 persons, including 17,900 persons who were evacuated from the "strict" control zone , and 8,800 persons who took part in eliminating the accident's aftereffects, and also 37,400 children. All groups of the population who are entered in the register undergo an annual clinical examination. This requires the involvement of additional forces and means, in particular, the regular dispatch of visiting duty teams of specialists to assist doctors in some rayon hospitals. Of course the "temporary assignment" method of work reflects negatively on the quality of medical assistance; however, owing to the severe shortage of doctors there is no other way out of the situation.

In connection with the enormous growth in oncological illnesses, V.S. Ulashchik cited specific data from which it follows that the increase in patients with malignant tumors in the Gomel and Mogilev oblasts in 1987-1988 practically did not differ from that which occurred previously in these regions. In Gomel Oblast, the increase was 5.5 percent (the average increase for the years 1983-86 was 5.3 percent). In Mogilev Oblast, the increase for the years 1987-88 was 6 percent (similar percentages of 7 percent in 1984 and 6 percent in 1985 were noted). For comparison, this figure is more than 7 percent in Grodno Oblast.

The minister noted that he in no way wants to say by this that everything is favorable with the health of people living on territories that are contaminated with radionuclides. On the contrary, certain trends in the changes in the condition of health of the populations of individual rayons worries the doctors very much.

Certain factual material was cited for illustrative purposes. Thus, in 1988 a trend was noted in the increase in child mortality in the Krasnopolskiy and Vetkovskiy rayons and the frequency of congenital anomalies in the Cherikovskiy and Klimovchskiy Rayons. In the Krasnopolskiy and Kostyukovichskiy Rayons, the oncological illnesses increased by a factor of 1.5 in 1988 by comparison with the years 1985-86. Among adults, an increase by a factor of 2-4 was noted of people suffering from nervous disorders, hypertonia, ischemic illness of the heart, diabetes, and chronic bronchitis.

Research showed that the number of chromosome aberrations increased, approximately by a factor of 1.5-2 by comparison with a natural background. Incidentally, speaking after that, Ye.F. Konoplya, an academician of the BSSR Academy of Sciences, made an fundamental refinement of this information. There are various kinds of chromosome aberrations, he noted, and those that are typical of radiation affliction have increased by a factor of 4- 10. This has to be taken into account.

The changes in thyroid glands, particularly of children, especially alarm the doctors. The combination of the influence of natural factors that are typical of Belorussia and the iodine radioisotopes led to weighting goiter endemism among children of some rayons of the republic. These trends compel the health organs to increase their attention on the endocrinological service and its laboratory support, for which, unfortunately, the conditions are inadequate, as was previously the case.

Answering the question as to what measures the Minzdrav [Ministry of Health] plans to undertake to increase the quality of medical assistance, V.S. Ulashchik noted that first of all it is necessary to resolve the problem of providing the stricken rayons medical personnel. The material and other bases for this have been set, and it is necessary to strengthen the idea and explanatory work among the young specialists, and also to receive assistance from the USSR Minzdrav.

It is also necessary to complete the technical equipping of the rayon hospitals of the stricken rayons as fast as possible. If all of the means that are planned for health safety will be allocated, and if the enterprises of the republic will help, as was done in 1988, then during 1990 the Minzdrav will be able to open up endoscopy and ultrasonic offices and furnish apparatuses to the laboratory service in the stricken rayons.

It was noted that the lack of necessary medication had a negative effect on the quality of medical help and on the morale of the population. The Minzdrav cannot, as was done in past years, satisfy the requests of these rayons at the expense of other rayons and oblasts, inasmuch as their requirement for medicines is even now only satisfied up to 70-75 percent. V.S. Ulashchik said further that it is supposed that "Soyuzfarmatsiya" [Union Pharmacy], finally, will fulfill the decision of the collegium of the USSR Minzdrav of 21 October 1989 concerning the centralized supply of medicines of the rayons that were exposed to radioactive contamination.

It was noted at the press conference that in some populated points of the stricken rayons the delivery of products is poorly organized, especially of fruit and vegetables and children's food. Also unsatisfactory are the conditions of labor for agricultural workers of the stricken rayons. In the kolkhozes [collective farm] and sovkhozes [state farm], 90 percent of the agricultural machinery is not equipped with airtight cabins, machine operators are furnished 70 percent of the requirement for the provision of everyday sanitary facilities, and the washing of special clothing is not centralized. Trade and public eating establishments do not have a sufficient number of technological and refrigeration equipment, and washing and decontamination means. The population is not provided with clean fuel in all of the villages.

and there is no centralized removal of ashes that contains radionuclides higher than the permissible levels.

The accident at the Chernobyl AES was so unexpected that all problems associated with the agro-industrial complex had to be decided, as they say, impromptu. A study of the radiation situation and the character of the nuclides, and their movement along the line soil-vegetation-animals was going on simultaneously with the development of methods to lower radioactivity. And how are we managing on the sick land today, and what awaits the peasant on it tomorrow? These questions were addressed by the journalists to I.N. Nikitchenko, the chairman of the Western Department of VASKhNIL [V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences].

The problem, he emphasized, is not only to remove contaminated soil from use and to withdraw crops from rotation that have been exposed the most to the action of radionuclides, but also to protect the population from the likelihood of coming across such contaminated products. A system of radiation control is being developed which in the Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee] alone numbers 393 laboratories with 20,000 instruments.

But it is already clear today: More effective technologies are needed for decontaminating the ground and for producing clean products on the farms. For this, it is not enough to unite the efforts of various departments and to assign responsibilities among them precisely. The republic needs an agricultural radiology center. It is time to involve the efforts of the all- union institutes and departments and the specialists of IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] and WHO [World Health Organization] in the concerns of the Belorussian agrarians and scientists.

Those who live and work on the wounded land discussed the problems associated with the government program with particular anguish and anxiety. One of these is I.N. Smolyar, secretary of the Gomel OK KPB [Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia], and chairman of the Permanent Commission on Questions of Eliminating the Aftereffects of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES of the BSSR Supreme Soviet. He did not conceal his distress over the fact that not one word was said about Chernobyl in the state plan for the development of the country in the new year, which was adopted by the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Also of concern is the fact that at a meeting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee , whose material was published in the newspaper PRAVDA, representatives of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic proposed waiting for the union program on the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident. If such a position prevails, I.N. Smolyar emphasized, one can imagine how this will affect our program from the standpoint of its financial and material support.

Continuing the discussion on the problems and difficulties associated with the implementation of the specific provisions of the program, I.N. Smolyar reproached those journalists, writers, and other cultural figures who, through their own incompetence, only harm the cause and enflame passions unnecessarily. For example, those who talk about the total resettlement of residents of stricken rayons from the Gomel and Mogilev oblasts. But where are they expected today? Where are they ready to create a complex of social and everyday living conditions for these people?

There is a shortage of truth—this is what troubles not only journalists and people from the zone, but all residents of the republic. But who is to blame for this? I.N. Smolyar suggested to those present, while the papers for all 3 years that have passed since the the Chernobyl trouble have not yet been transferred to the archives, that they clarify and relate for the readers why those who designed and brought about the accident, and who today are advising us how to live in the zone, are not held responsible.

Participants in the conference considered quite a few specific, serious, and at times critical questions associated with our main misfortune. Those present were disturbed, for example, by a report that more than a thousand dollars has already been transferred to the Belorussian fund for measures to eliminate the aftereffects of the accident. Academician V.P. Platonov noted in this respect that the whole problem lies in the sluggishness of the Belorussian representatives at the United Nations and workers of the MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs].

Someone in the auditorium proposed that hard currency be earned for the implementation of a state program of sales of unique information abut the effects of radiation on the organism and the effectiveness of measures that are undertaken. Even an international information center could be created in the republic.

The situation with respect to personal dosimeters seriously disturbs journalists and, however, all residents of the republic as well. As was reported by V.B. Nesterenko, corresponding member of the BSSR Academy of Sciences, Belorussia could have produced 100,000 "Sosna" dosimeters as early as last year, which many people could have in their hands today. If the production of certain parts had been arranged. The question also arose about the cost of a dosimeter. At present, the approximate price of a set is rather high, but the people in the stricken rayons should receive it free of charge. As for the almost 3-year delay in the production of the instrument, then the blame for everything lies with the existing concept: A panic will start if you give dosimeters to the population. However, life has shown it is precisely the lack of information that causes a panic.

Summing up the results of the press conference, A.S. Kamay, secretary of the KPB Central Committee, especially emphasized the importance of the association of

the forces of scientists, specialists, party and soviet workers, and the population in the fight against the common misfortune. It is only in this way that it will be possible to fully implement the program of eliminating the aftereffects of the accident and to further develop the economy and culture of the republic. Life has subjected us to a severe test, which we have to pull through with dignity.

New Gomel Obkom First Secretary Elected

90UN0530A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 p 1

[Text] Gomel, 22 November (BELTA)—There has been a session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies here which examined an organizational matter.

In connection with the election of A.A. Grakhovskiy as first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Gomel Obkom [oblast party committee], he was relieved of his duties as chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee]. Three candidacies for the vacant office were submitted for the deputies' examination: N.G. Voytenkov, head of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Agrarian Department; V.K. Levchik, first deputy chairman of the oblispolkom; and I.N. Smolyar, secretary of the obkom.

As a result of a secret ballot, Nikolay Grigoryevich Voytenkov gained an absolute majority and was duly elected chairman of the Gomel Oblispolkom.

The session was addressed by Yu.M. Khusainov, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic State Agroindustrial Committee, and A.A. Grakhovskiy, first secretary of the obkom.

Georgian SSR Decree on Military Service

90US0322A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 30 Nov 89 p 1

[Decree of Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet: "On the Information of the Work Group for Developing Proposals Concerning Questions of Restoring National Military Formations and Service of Recruits From the Republic on the Territory of the Georgian SSR"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic hereby decrees:

1. To take under advisement information from the work group for developing proposals concerning questions of restoring national military formations and the service of recruits from the republic on the territory of the Georgian SSR.

2. To bring up as a legislative initiative before the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of restoring Georgian national military formations as a party of the USSR Armed Forces.

3. To raise the following questions before the USSR Ministry of Defense:
restoring Georgian military formations in the form of two units (motorized infantry and mountain infantry divisions) whose organizational structure and equipment, with the agreement of the corresponding republic departments, would be worked out and determined by the USSR Ministry of Defense;
opening in Tbilisi a multiprofile higher military school for training Georgian national cadres of officers of the Soviet Army (on the basis of the former Tbilisi military school);
having most of the recruits who are permanent residents of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] perform their compulsory military service on the territory of the republic (if they wish);
staffing the border troops of the Transcaucasian Military District and the Ministry of Internal Affairs mainly with local youth.

4. To raise before the USSR Supreme Soviet, in connection with the complicated demographic and social situation in the Georgian SSR, the question of making the following changes in the USSR law "On Universal Military Service":

Georgian SSR citizens are not liable for military service if they:

a) have a family and one child;
b) have only a mother or father;
c) work in occupations of which there is a shortage in the republic (the list of occupations is established by the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers);
d) are the only sons.

5. To raise before the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet the question, when drawing up the new constitution of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, of restoring to it, with the corresponding corrections and taking the real situation into account, the articles concerning national military formations that were in effect in the Georgian SSR constitutions of 1922 and 1937.

6. To form a commission of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet for working with youth who have been recruited into the ranks of the Soviet Army from the Georgian SSR.

[Signed] Chairman of the Presidium of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet, G. Gumbaridze.
[Signed] Secretary of the Presidium of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet, V. Kvaratskheliya. Tbilisi. 18 November 1989

150,000 Azeris Demonstrate in Baku 4 Jan

AU0501134090 Paris AFP in English 1259 GMT 5 Jan 90

[Stephane Bentura report]

[Text] Moscow, Jan 5 (AFP)— More than 150,000 Azeri nationalists demanding the opening of the border

between Nakhichevan and Iran demonstrated on Thursday in the Azerbaijan capital Baku, which has been closed "temporarily" to foreign journalists, nationalist sources told AFP on Friday.

The Popular Front for Nakhichevan, an autonomous region of Azerbaijan bordering Iran, issued a new ultimatum to border guards to remove all barriers as of Friday, according to INTERFAX, a Radio Moscow publication.

"Representatives of the Popular Front went into barracks to warn soldiers that after January 5, their quarters would be set on fire if they were still there", INTERFAX said.

The latest demonstration on Thursday came as Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov in Moscow tried to play down the seriousness of the disturbances on the border, explaining that the problem would be settled in the same way as the problem with Soviet eskimos in Siberia who are allowed to cross into Alaska without visas.

But Niasi Ibraguim, secretary of the nationalist Democratic Party of Azerbaijan Yeni Mussavat, said the offer to open the border for trade between local people was "a promise that has never been kept and is intended to quieten the people down". Reached by telephone, he said it was "not the first time that the authorities have made such proposals".

According to Mr Ibraguim, between 150,000 and 200,000 people took part in a rally on Thursday afternoon in Lenin Square, which the nationalists have renamed "Freedom Square". A spokeswoman for the moderate Social Democratic party, Liela Iussunova, estimated the crowd at "less than 100,000".

Mr Ibraguim said the rally had originally been called to discuss Nagorno-Karabakh—the disputed Armenian enclave within Azerbaijan and focus of serious interethnic clashes in the past two years—but had ended up concentrating on Nakhichevan, an Azeri enclave in Armenia.

He said the movement had sent telegrams to the Supreme Soviet (parliament) and Golstelradio, the management of Soviet television, to complain about the "tendentious" coverage of events on the border, which blamed the trouble on "extremists".

INTERFAX meanwhile reported that in Baku two monuments to the founders of Soviet Azerbiajan had been vandalised, as well as another to the founder of the Cheka, the precursor of the KGB secret service.

A spokesman for the republic's foreign ministry said by telephone that the first two monuments had been "withdrawn for restoration".

Local papers reported Thursday that the first secretary of the communist party in Nakhichevan, M.G. Isaev, had been dismissed and replaced by A. Jalilov.

Nakhichevan also has a border with Turkey, although only 12 kilometres (seven and a half miles) in length along the river Aras.

Azerbaijan's prime minister, Ayaz Niyazoglu Mutalibov, was expected in Istanbul later Friday for a five-day visit to Turkey, including talks next week in Ankara with Prime Minister Turgut Ozal and President Kenan Evren.

Local newspapers said they expected Ankara to roll out the red carpet for Mr. Mutalibov. Since the European Economic Community adjourned consideration on Turkey's request to join the EEC sine die, Ankara has expressed its keenness to improve ties with "Turks abroad", in particular Turkish-speaking communities in Soviet Moslem republics.

The reopening of the border with Nakhichevan is under consideration, but observers said the creation of a free market zone between Mount Ararat and the Soviet and Iranian borders would need careful planning.

Turkey opened a "free market" along its border with Iranian Azerbaijan at Sarisiu in December.

Baku Reports Arrival of Girenko, Nishanov

NC0401192290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] As has already been reported, observation points in an area on the Soviet border with Iran tens of kilometers long were smashed and technical engineering installations, communication lines, and border posts damaged as a result of the incidents in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR], which took place between 31 December 1989 and 2 January 1990. An inquiry group has been set up in the republic to study the outcome of this lawless behavior. The group is made up of the responsible members of the Azerbaijan Soviet socialist Republic [SSR] Committee for State Security, the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Azerbaijan SSR Procuracy.

Meanwhile, a group composed of Andrey Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme soviet Council of Nationalities; and a number of the responsible workers of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR law enforcing organs is in our republic to help the party and soviet organs stabilize the situation in the border region and in some of the border rayons.

The situtation was examined at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee on the night of 3 January and measures were decided upon to normalize the situation in the republic's border rayons. Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the meeting.

The meeting that was held by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau earlier examined the

question of mass disturbances on the state border in the Nakhichevan ASSR and categorically condemned the incidents.

The disruption of USSR law on the Soviet Union's state borders and the violation of international norms have inflicted a serious blow on the reconstruction process in the republic.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau noted the gradual normalization of the situation and expressed confidence that similar activities will not occur again. The republic and local soviet organs were instructed to resolve all the problems that have been created for the people in the border rayons and contribute toward the effort that is being made to help the border units gradually restore the damaged installations.

The fact that an investigation has been launched into the disruption of the Soviet border regime was noted.

Comrades Girenko, Nishanov, and Vezirov traveled to Nakhichevan today.

Visit Border Region

LD0401162990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1539 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Baku, 4 Jan (TASS)—As has already been reported, from 31 December-2 January unprecedented actions occurred in the territory of the Nakhichevan autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, when extremists persons ruined tens of kilometers of plowed land and destroyed engineering and technical structures, lines of communication, and border towers on the Soviet-Iranian border. In order to investigate the causes of all this and the results of these illegal acts, an investigative group has been created in the republic. This group, which is now at work, includes senior personnel of Azerbaijan's Committee for State Security, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the republican procuracy.

In order to help party and local soviet bodies to stabilize the situation on the border and in a number of border regions, Andrey Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and a group of senior personnel of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and law enforcement bodies are now in the republic.

Yesterday evening the Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee discussed the situation and worked out measures to normalize the situation in the Azerbaijani border areas. Abdul- Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the meeting.

Earlier, the bureau of the Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee met to examine the question of widespread disturbances in the region of the state border in the republic and to resolutely condemn them. The crude violation of the USSR law "on the state border of the USSR" and international norms is a serious blow to the process of perestroyka in the republic.

Noting the gradual stabilization of the situation, the central committee bureau expressed the assurance that there would be no repetition of these events.

The republic and local soviet bodies have been instructed to tackle all the specific questions raised by the inhabitants of the border regions, and also to take part in rendering aid to the border units in urgently reconstructing destroyed buildings.

It has been made known that an investigation is under way into the instance of a crude violation of the USSR state border.

Andrey Girenko, Rafik Nishanov, and Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov left today for Nakhichevan.

Illegal Border Crossings Into Iran Viewed

NC0501132890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Excerpts] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs has revealed the following:

[Passage on theft of property omitted] We gave information earlier on the destruction of border posts and technical installations in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] from 31 December 1989 to 2 January 1990. A number of the citizens of Nakhichevan ASSR illegally crossed the border into Iran at the places where the incidents occurred.

Kyazim Aliyev, a driver employed by the Kirov collective farm in Il'ichevskiy Rayon, and Tanah Faradzhov and Kahraman Ferdaliyev, who are 22 years old and who live in Kyvrak village in Il'ichevskiy Rayon, crossed into Iran at a point close to (?Shakhbasti) village. Kahraman Ferdaliyev turned back about 10 minutes later. However, his colleagues remained in Iran. A short while before this incident took place, Mukhabbat Dzhalilov, 20, who lives in (?Azer) village in Ordubadskiy Rayon, also crossed into Iran. Dzhalilov was employed by the state farm named after the 26 Baku Commissars.

Meanwhile, a number of criminals suspected of causing (serious damage) while robbing [words indistinct] some time ago were captured yesterday.

Ethnic Unrest in NKAO

NC0401130090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 3 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Correspondent Akhmetly details the information made available by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs:

[Begin Akhmetly recording] [Passage on theft of property and valuables omitted] Here are a number of facts about the developments in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]:

Fire was directed at the Sabir State Farm in Kubatlinskiy Rayon from the new Goris town in Armenian SSR's Gorisskiy Rayon on 2 January. Unidentified individuals placed explosives two meters away from the house of Eldar Guseynov, who is a skilled worker employed by [words indistinct] and who lives in house number five in [word indistinct]. No one was wounded by the blast and no damage has been reported.

The truck of Dzhabbar Mamedov, who lives in Agdam and who works as an employee of the construction administration in Khodzhaly, was stoned from the [words indistinct] as he drove through the main town in Askeranskiy Rayon. The (?windshield) of the truck was shattered and a passanger who was traveling in it, Ismail Mamedov, was injured.

Meanwhile, a meeting was held by the rayon branch of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan in Mir-Bashirskiy Rayon. The front's representatives from 11 rayons participated in the meeting. The participants urged the USSR people's deputies and the deputies of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet to have the motorways linking Mir-Bashir and Kel'badzhar and Agdam and Shusha opened by 10 January. Otherwise, they said, they will (?take action.)

A report was carried in the [name indistinct] program from Moscow in connection with the destruction of frontier posts in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. According to the report, frontier posts in an area of 68 km [words indistinct] were destroyed from 31 December 1989 to 2 January 1990.

Meanwhile, Gasan Mamedaliyev, who lives in [name indistinct] town in Ordubadskiy Rayon and who works as an engineer in [name indistinct], has crossed the Aras River into Iran. [end recording]

Yerevan Compares NKAO, Nakhichevan Incidents

NC0401123090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1700 GMT 3 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Here is a report by Gevorg Nazaryan from Theater Square.

[Begin Nazaryan recording] The sleet that started this morning altered the plan of the New Year Tree Committee of the Armenian National Movement. People, young and old, have been coming to this familiar square since 26 December for the festivities here. Today it is important for us to hear the opinions of the representatives of the public; are they satisfied or dissatisfied? After all, this is the first time that pan-national festivities have been held for them. [passage omitted].

People offered opinions not only about the organization of the new year festivities, but also (?touched upon) the fragmentary reportage of the news program about Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and Nakhichevan. We have obtained information that the Shushi-Agdam bus has not traveled along its established route but instead has passed right through Stepanakert 1-3 km off the main road. The people gathered ask: Was trying to find out the posture and restraint exercised by the Armenians of Artsakh [NKAO] intentional?

The people are also expressing their disillusionment with the report published in today's PRAVDA concerning the incidents in Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic. To begin with, they are enraged PRAVDA uses all sorts of colorful adjectives when it comes to peaceful rallies and demonstrations, and yet, here, when the intoxicated mob has destroyed 137 km border structures, it published this report simply under the following headline: Disorder at the Border. You would think some students have created disorder in the classroom.

People are amazed: When an innocent animal trespasses the border Moscow knows about it within minutes and have already made a decision. Yet here they have vandalized the border for three consecutive days and no appropriate measure has been adopted. In any case, our people have already become familiar with the style and attitude of the central information media. Why has an order been issued in Stepanakert to fire upon and kill those who stoned the vehicles, but no such order was issued during these 3 days for those who vandalized the state borders? [end recording].

Details 2 Jan Incident in NKAO

NC0501120790 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 4 Jan (ARMENPRES)—On 2 January 1990 Stepanakert witnessed a second tragic incident within the last 3 months. [passage omitted.]

The cadets used firearms and four Stepanakert residents were wounded, including Armen Agopyan, the best sculptor in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The father of three children, he died in the hospital from stomach wounds. Roza Ata Babayan from Golatag village in Mardakertskiy Rayon, born in 1917, happened to be at the site of the incident and died of heart attack after being taken to the hospital. Two cadets were wounded and four others were injured.

According to the Shusha Internal Affairs Department statement, nine Azerbaijanis were wounded (?during) the Stepanakert incident, and all the buses were damaged. The NKAO procuracy is investigating the incident.

These are the preliminary facts. The full picture of this incident will be revealed only after a detailed investigation.

Another tragedy. This incident is a replica of the one in the center of the oblast, in exactly the same place, last October. As was the case then, the local party, soviet, and security authorities were again not informed about the passage of the convoy. Most amazing is the persistent disregard of the psychological condition of the oblast's Armenian population which for almost two years has

been virtually cut off from the outside world because of the cruel blockade. People are justifiably inquiring why the troops do not attempt to unblock the Lachin road which connects NKAO not only with Armenia but also with other parts of the country. [passage omitted]

The NKAO Special Administration Committee held a consultative meeting on the evening of 2 January. Leaders of the command office of the special situation and of local authorities participated. They decided to normalize the situation through joint efforts.

And as was expected, on 2-3 January the city was disorganized. From 0105 to 0500, intense rifle firing came from Kirkirdzhan Azeri settlement at the upper edge of Stepanakert. The Stepanakert Internal Affairs City Department is looking into the incident. Other illegal acts have happened also. A few cases of vehicle stoning was observed on 3 January. According to preliminary reports, there were no casualties.

It is sad that the new year for NAKO commenced with disagreeable incidents. Will they be the last?

Deputies Appeal to Gorbachev

NC0501103490 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1700 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] USSR People's Deputies Zori Balayan, Vagan Gabrielyan, Vachakan Grigoryan, Boris Dadamyan, and Genrikh Pogosyan have made the following appeal to Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

Another tragic incident took place on 2 January 1990 in Stepanakert. A convoy of buses en route to Shushinskiy Rayon in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] from Azerbaijan escorted by a militray detail entered Stepanakert for unknown reasons despite the existence of a circuitious route, without giving the local authorities any advance notice. When the local population tried to stop the convoy to find out the reasons for and circumstances of its being there, the escorting army detail opened fire. Two persons died and three were seriously wounded.

The extreme similarity to the 10 October incident in Stepanakert last year leaves no doubt of (?premeditation) aimed at instigating hostility between the troops and the Armenian population of the NKAO. The Azerbaijan leadership attempted to use NKAO to divert the attention of the central government and the public of the country from the bloody incidents taking place in Dzhalilabad, Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic, and in other regions in Azerbaijan. Otherwise, the sudden appearance of a car convoy under military escort in the center of Stepanakert at the very time when one tremor follows the other in Azerbaijan is incomprehensible. The escort troops wittingly or unwittingly assisted the provocateurs; they let themselves be dragged into the dirty political game.

VREMYA acted similarly in its haste to air [words indistinct] about the Stepanakert tragedy. (?Undoubtedly that cruel attempt was premeditated.) The situation in the region is getting out of control. We demand that a deputies commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet be sent to Stepanakert to assess the situation, and then submit a report to the USSR people's deputies.

Armenians in Azerbaijan Want To Join Armenia

NC0401065290 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Dear compatriots, our colleague Ayk Karapetyan recently returned from northern Artsakh's [Shaumyanovskiy and Khanlarskiy rayons of Azerbaijan republic] Getashen village which is situated close to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] adjacent to Shaumyanovskiy rayon. Here is his report entitled "Getashen the Contemporary Zeytoun" [Zeytoun was an Armenian village in southeastern Anatolia which resisted Turkish attacks during the 19th century and became a symbol of heroic villages].

[Begin recording] [Karapetyan] The very survival of the Getashen village during these two last eventful, difficult, and fateful years for the Armenian people seems legendary as well as an undecipherable riddle. [passage omitted]

Today, Getashen's struggle for self-defense illustrates anew our people's heroism. What is Getashen but a legend [words indistinct]? Getashen is a contemporary Zeytoun and Musa Mountain [an Armenian village on the Mediterranean coast which put up a resistence against the Turks during World War I until they were evacuated by the allied navy]. Though bold and firm, it has no intention of suffering the same sad fate of Zeytoun and Mousa Mountain. [passage omitted].

Getashen village also resolved to defend the surrounding Armenian villages of Kamo, Azat, Martunashen, (GusiArmavir), and Aygestan. Unfortunately, the last two gave in to the threats of the Azerbaijan Popular Front and were uprooted. That development narrowed the defensive circle of Getashen and the other three villages, but it also made the people of Getashen more determined and united. This is not the first time they have faced such a grave situation.

Before the Great Patriotic War the village had a population of 10,000; today only 3,500 people live there. That was because of the anti-Armenian policy pursued by the Azerbaijan leadership and which was applied actively and deliberately for decades. [passage omitted]. However, the Karabakh movement stopped the departures and united the villagers. For the last 2 years no Getashen resident has left the village. The people of Getashen and the other three villages have often appealed to the highest Soviet authorities requesting incorporation into the neighboring Shaumyanovskiy Rayon since all the ties have been severed with Khanlar, which threatens these villages. Failing to receive a reply, they convened a

congress of the plenipotentiary representatives of these villages on 23 November. This congress elected a National Council, and appealed to Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, on behalf of these villages, to absorb them into its structure. Here is Maghakel Guruchiyan, chairman of the Getashen National Council.

[Guruchiyan] We have managed to detach ourselves completely from Khanlarskiy Rayon; we will survive, defend ourselves, and will certainly unite with Armenia. We have decided to organize things this year so that we will be able to survive independently even if Armenia cannot send in assistance. (?We believe we can defend ourselves) and we certainly hope to unite with Shaumyanovskiy Rayon which will unite with NKAO and the latter with Armenia. There is no other alternative. [passage indistinct] [end recording] [passage omitted].

New Chairman Elected to Armenian Civil Aviation

NC0301140790 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] Yerevan, 2 Jan (ARMENPRES)—Ovannes Yeritsyan, a 48-year-old first rate pilot, was unanimously elected as the new chairman of the Armenian Civil Aviation Department at a conference of the workers' collectives of the Armenian Civil Aviation Department. Following his election, most of the questions he was asked by 500 delegates (dealt) with ways to provide practical assistance to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], to the population of Artsakh [NKAO] and to the aviation workers.

Ovannes Yeritsyan was born in the NKAO and since 1964 has worked in the Armenian Civil Aviation Department, after graduating from the Krasnokutsk aviation school in Saratov oblast. He has contributed greatly to retraining pilots. Five out of eight crew members flying Il-86 helicopters belonging to the Armenian Department are his students.

While flying back and forth across the atmosphere, he graduated from the Economics Department of Yerevan University. He did post-graduate work at the Civil Aviation Academy and successfully defended his doctoral thesis. He is now a post-graduate student in psychology, the only one so far in Soviet aviation. He completed his thesis some time ago, but has not found time to defend it. For the last 3 months he has been acting chairman of the Armenian Civil Aviation Department.

The conference of the workers' collectives of the Armenian Civil Aviation Department also unanimously decided to absorb the Stepanakert airport into the structure of the Armenian Department.

Nagorno-Karabakh Commission Chairman Approved

LD0401181490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has approved Vladimir Foteyev, a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, as chairman of the Union Motoring and Observation [kontrolno-nablyudatelnaya] Commission on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Kurdish Writer Condemns Azerbaijan's Treatment

NC2212120389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Statement by Kurdish writer (Datiyeve Ashu)—recorded]

[Text] At the instigation of Azeri chauvanists, someone named Babayev, a Kurd from Baku, sent a letter to the second congress of the USSR people's deputies. After distorting and fabricating facts, Babayev alleged that 18,000 Kurds have been forced to emigrate from Armenia. That [word indistinct] deceitful letter aroused a wave of indignation among the Kurds living in Armenia. The Kurds are condemining the author of that [word indistinct] letter and the leaders of the so-called Azerbaijan National Front who are behind that letter.

The letter, besides hoping to sow seeds of enmity and [word indistinct], also seeks to slander the Armenian people and prevent a just solution of the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. The vast majority of the Kurds of Armenia continue to coexist with their Armenian brothers, daily advancing their national culture. Today, no one can deny that Soviet Armenia has become the greatest center for Kurdish culture and Kurdology not only in our country, but in the entire world.

It would have been better if our compatriot Babayev in Baku had concerned himself with the fate of the Kurds in Azerbaijan, toward whom the leadership of that republic applied a policy of forced assimilation which can also be described as cultural genocide. The result of that policy is that today no Kurds remain in Azerbaijan and the Kurdish province has long since been dissolved, although the author of the aforesaid letter appeals for its restoration.

Finally, I must say that I cannot strongly condemn our compatriot in Baku because the author of the letter is not Babayev himself. A real Kurd could only be filled with profound gratitude toward the Armenian people. I would advise my compatriot not to lose his bearings and not to become a tool in the hands of those Azeri chauvinists who subjected a substantial portion of his native people to forced assimilation.

Uzbek Official Comments on Election Experience

90UN0518A Tashkent KOMSOMOLETS UZBEKISTANA in Russian 28 Nov 89 p 2

[Interview with Tulkun Khamidovich Sabitov, chairman of the Uzbek Central Electoral Commission: "Will There Be Enough Nominations for all the Candidates?"]

[Text] The engine of the election campaign is gathering speed. There remain less than 3 months to the day when the voters will decide by whom the 500 seats of Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputies will be held.

We have for many years interpreted the laws freely, leaving at the level of a declaration at times their most essential provisions, substituting for them legally binding instruments, instructions and regulations. It is all the more the desire that the present election campaign and the elections themselves establish legal democratic initiatives.

Did we accumulate experience at last year's elections? How does the present campaign differ from previous ones? Tulkun Khamidovich Sabitov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, answers these and other questions of our correspondent Anton Chernov.

[Sabitov] Speaking of the differences of the present election campaign, mention should be made primarily of the change in the social and political atmosphere in the country and the republic and the accumulated democratic experience, without which no law-making activity, even the most positive—I refer to the new law on elections of people's deputies of the republic—has any validity.

Whence the mechanism of the choice basis of the elections. After all, the law does not specifically limit the number of candidates running for a single okrug. But all subsequent provisions presuppose a choice basis, and it is reflected in the voting procedure and in the equal right of all candidates to engage in electioneering.

As far as the law itself directly is concerned, there are many changes therein. These include the article on the incompatibility of the status of people's deputy and official position and the timeframe of elections. These include, finally, a new right—to nominate candidates per the place of residence. The Central Electoral Commission, which previously operated up to the first session of the new Supreme Soviet, is now formed for 5 years. Earlier all questions connected with the recall and replacement of deputies were decided by the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Now these questions are handled by the Central Electoral Commission.

[Chernov] In what is the Central Electoral Commission involved currently? What difficulties and conflict situations are being encountered at the present stage of its work?

[Sabitov] Since the republic Supreme Soviet session, on 20 October, when the Central Electoral Commission was confirmed, we have had two working meetings, at which we have dealt with various questions of an organizational nature. The forms of the ballot papers and the bona fides of the candidates for deputy have been determined and a briefing letter—work recommendations for the okrug electoral commissions—has been drawn up.

The main task of the Central Electoral Commission consists of ensuring the uniform fulfillment of the law on elections. The law cannot be universal, life is far more diverse. There are in the law provisions giving rise to varying interpretations. So it is the Central Electoral Commission which adopts a decision when a contentious situation arises.

Here is an example from day-to-day work. We received a telegram from voters requesting that we intervene apropos a violation of the election law in respect of the nomination of candidates per the place of residence. The Central Electoral Commission instructed the okrug commission to investigate and report within 3 days on the essence of the conflict and the measures adopted. It is further a question also of the fact that the citizens do not always correctly interpret and sometimes simply do not know the provisions of the law, and it is our job to explain each point and investigate each conflict situation. It is on this that our work in interaction with the okrug and precinct electoral commissions is based.

[Chernov] And what shortcomings of last year's election campaign should be avoided, in your view?

[Sabitov] Proceeding from the experience of last year's elections, we may anticipate certain situations and, naturally, try to avoid them. It is possible, for example, that the local soviet ispolkoms [executive committees] and the corresponding okrug electoral commissions will prevent the holding of meetings for the nomination of candidates. We heard at a meeting in the Central Electoral Commission a report on measures implemented by a Tashkent rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee] pertaining to the preparations for and the nomination of candidates at meetings per the citizens' place of residence. It turned out that an explanation of the provisions of the election law regulating the powers of the citizens' meetings is as yet being undertaken insufficiently among the population. The commission instructed the okrug electoral commissions to initiate this work in conjunction with the appropriate soviet ispolkoms on a day-to-day basis.

A refusal to register candidates must unfailingly be substantiated and based on a precise interpretation of the law.

Electioneering should not be performed on election day, but there were instances of such in the spring. Finally, money for electioneering activities in support of the

candidate nominated by a given enterprise or organization should not be attracted from this enterprise or organization, which has already been encountered.

[Chernov] The election campaign is being financed from the state budget, but what money is allocated this candidate or the other?

[Sabitov] We cannot refer to and look at the experience of foreign countries, where the outcome of the voting could depend on the financial support obtained by a candidate. We cannot talk about financial questions of the election campaign in isolation from our system. The law accords registered candidates equal rights and assistance in election work, financial assistance included. All printed electioneering publications are produced centrally, and all the candidates' business, travel and other expenditure is reimbursed. In addition, the use of one's own resources and enterprise resources is prohibited. The spending quota per precinct commission, for example, is R600.

[Chernov] Tulkun Khamidovich, what work is being performed with the young voters?

[Sabitov] The Central Electoral Commission does not work with the electorate directly. Neither those who are in the constituency for the first time nor others. This is done by the electoral commissions locally, we only give recommendations and receive the accounts and reports of the public organizations. The Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League], for example, is represented on the Central Electoral Commission by Comrade Kadyrov, secretary of the Uzbek LKSM [Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee. We have to keep a strict eye on observance of the law and see that age qualifications are not violated and that there is no indirect or direct limitation of the suffrage of the republic's citizens.

[Chernov] Which public organizations are putting forward their candidates? How many nominations will this organization or the other be accorded?

[Sabitov] As distinct from the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies, the republic election law does not provide for separate nomination from the public organizations. A republic, oblast, rayon or city authority of any public organization may at its conference or plenum nominate its representative. So there is no question of any quotas. Following the elections in 500 okrugs, 500 candidates will receive their deputy's credentials.

New Ministry, State Committee in Kazakh SSR

LD0401230190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] The Presidium of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet has resolved to establish a republican Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry of the Kazakh SSR. The Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet has also resolved to establish a republican State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations of the Kazakh SSR.

Investigation of 1986 Alma-Ata Riots Viewed

90UN0533A WA2812205089 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 51, 20 Dec 89 p 14

[Article by Aleksandr Samoylenko and Vladislav Yanelis, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA special correspondents: "Alma-Ata. December 1986. Then and Now"]

[Text] It seemed that that December tragedy of 1986 in Alma-Ata was forgotten, and that it had passed into history, pushed into the background by more recent and more dramatic events. And we today are once again returning to that cold December... Not in order to pay tribute to a sad anniversary, but because circumstances compel us to do this.

We recall 6 June 1989. The meeting hall of the First USSR Congress of People's Deputies. This is from a speech of writer M. Shakhanov, a USSR People's Deputy:

"After bringing up the question at the congress concerning the events in Georgia, a group of deputies of Kazakhstan is receiving a mass of telegrams and collective letters from their constituents. They are unhappy about the fact that, even with the glasnost and frankness at the congress, we are not raising the question of the December 1986 events in Alma-Ata, when, for the first time in the history of the country, engineer shovels and service dogs were used against peaceful demonstrators, and girls were beaten with clubs and tarpaulin boots... Up until now, the number of victims among the demonstrators has been concealed from the public...

"In this connection, we earnestly request that a commission be established from among people's deputies who represent various regions and nationalities to bring out the real truth about the December events in Alma-Ata."

Later, Mukhtar Shakhanov himself will explain to us the step he took, saying that, after discussing the Tbilisi tragedy at the congress, he received telegrams addressed to him demanding an investigation into the Alma-Ata events. And so, the Tbilisi April compelled the deputy to turn to the Alma-Ata December.

Shakhanov adds in a conversation with one of us that he believed the people who accused the authorities of covering up the truth about December. "The heart of a poet does not deceive me," he observes, "there were more victims than was announced officially."

Rumors spread in the republic about innumerable victims of a December slaughter who were secretly buried outside the city, about soldiers who ploughed with their boots through innocent young boys and girls, and about ferocious dogs who tore the flesh of the demonstrators,

and god knows about what else. Leaflets were distributed among the youth, where these rumors took on the appearance of facts.

We do not want to raise doubts about the foreboding of "a poet's heart." But we are looking into this for the sake of the real truth.

We will talk about that which has not been talked about yet, in order to put an end to rumors. So, here is the chronicle of those days.

On 16 December 1986, a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan was held. D.A. Kunayev was relieved of his duties of first secretary of the Central Committee "in connection with going on pension." G.V. Kolbin was elected first secretary. This plenum was certainly the briefest in the history of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan. Within 18 minutes after it opened, D.A. Kunayev, remaining a member of the politburo and a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU, became a pensioner: There was applause twice: during Kunayev's release from duties, and during Kolbin's confirmation. Authority was turned over in a situation of "great satisfaction" that reigned in the hall at that time.

But by no means outside its walls.

Today we do not think strange the reaction of the radically disposed national youth, who sincerely and fervently welcomed the political ideas of April 1985, to which the procedure of the plenum, to put it mildly, did not conform. It was understood that Kunayev had to leave—his style of leadership outlived itself, and, moreover, it was discredited. The people hungered for renewal and it could be brought only by new people and new ideas, and they should not come the way they did before.

From operational reports of the KGB and MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] of those days (style of the reports is retained):

18.12.86. 2100-2230. Residence hall of the Alma-Ata Theater-Arts Institute. Students S.A. Zhurmadilov, A.I. Dzhumashev, K.R. Baybakov, and R.D. Tokushev went through a number of rooms and stirred up the students with their disapproval of the decision of the 5th plenum. During the discussions, a proposal was made to express their protest by going out onto Brezhnev Square. At that time, their fellow students A.D. Kanetov, B.Zh. Imangozhayev, K. Aytmurzayev, and U.A. Seytinbekov carried on instigative work in residence hall No 1 of the Institute of Foreign Languages, where they were actively supported...

17.12.86. 0845. The KGB duty officer of the republic received a report from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan that groups of youths are gathering on Brezhnev Square. A KGB operational group drove out to the square... A crowd of more than 200 persons was in the square, and some of them carried posters with the slogans: "Each nation must have its own leader!"

1020. The crowd grew quickly, and it moved toward the tribune. Two slogans could be heard in the crowd: "Long live Lenin's ideas (in the Kazakh language), and in the Russian language—"We are for a voluntary rapprochement of nations, but not for one that is forced...."

Working on these observations, we looked over numerous photographs, movie films, and video materials. They were taken on the square in front of the Central Committee where the December tragedy gradually unfolded and reached its dramatic peak. The worried authorities were forced (apart from the outer cordoning off) to concentrate 500 officer candidates of one of the military schools of the city as a reserve and to station two BMP's [infantry combat vehicle] in the internal courtyard of the Central Committee in the event that the demonstrators broke through the cordon into the building of the Central Committee....

We will leaf through several pages of this tragic chronicle. Especially as our task does not involve its complete rendering. We will say only that the confrontation of the authorities and the demonstrators could have ended even more dramatically, because the authorities at that time would not have compromised.

The results of the December tragedy are stated in reports of the Procurator's Office of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Ministry of Health. They were not published.

"As a result of the mass disorders of 17-19 December 1986 in the square and streets of Alma-Ata, 10 automobiles were burned and 152 were damaged, including 16 fire brigade, 2 militia, and 12 military vehicles.

"In the course of the illegal actions, two persons were killed—Savitskiy and Aristov. During armed opposition to representatives of authority, Sypatayev sustained serious bodily injury and died in the hospital without regaining consciousness. One thousand two hundred and thirty-three persons went to medical establishments for help, of which 774 were militia workers, servicemen of the internal troops, and officer candidates of schools of the MVD and public order volunteers, and 235 were hospitalized. To prevent more serious consequences, the organs of internal affairs arrested 2,401 participants in the mass disorders. Courts of the Kazakh SSR reviewed the criminal cases of 99 persons, and all of them were convicted." (Ten persons remain in jail to this day.)

At that time, in December 1986, all of this had to be explained somehow, not going outside the scope of stock phrases that were approved in the 1930's. Thus, an official version was born and circulated further about dope addicts, drunken persons, extremists, parasites, and other antisocial elements. And also about Kazakh nationalists. There was no mention anywhere then about the political motives that drew the people to the square.

Thus, on 17 December the people wanted to talk with the national authority about the rights and problems of the people. And the people wanted to be heard. How did it happen that a political protest, with which Kazakh youth came to the square in front of the Central Committee, was transformed into a slaughter?

At the very beginning, teams of militia snatched from the crowd, from their standpoint, the most dangerous "rabble-rousers," first of all those who proclaimed political ideas that were incompatible with official stereotypes, and those who carried placards. Thus, the political demonstrators who played the role of leaders on the square, and whom the masses followed, were isolated. But it is exactly they who sought a peaceful political dialogue. The square was in the power of the elements. Sticks, stones, and iron rods went into action. And the response was clubs.

We had to say all of this if only because there was only silence before about the political motives of the Alma-Ata events.

Two and a half years have passed. The lessons of the Alma-Ata December have not been grasped in other places; nonetheless, the residents of Kazakhstan themselves learned a lot. And first and foremost that threatening shouts, the club, and the iron rod are unsuitable instruments for the resolution of public-political and social problems.

Coming out of the shock, the republic looked into itself. People of various nationalities seemingly realized once again that only together could they put an end to that which interfered with their lives. The authorities began to speak frankly with the people in a language that was understandable to them about matters that really disturbed them—about April, about the Semipalatinsk test range, about the grievous situation with the Kazakh language, and about the lack of housing... Hopes were revived. Life began to make sense. It continued this way, we repeat, for two and a half years.

Now about that which Shakhanov must have known when speaking at the congress. The demonstrators were the first to use weapons against the cordon consisting of MVD troops and servicemen. They literally were knocking militia workers out of the ranks with pieces of marble and with rocks. The actions of the authorities were retaliatory only. Dogs did not tear up the demonstrators, although they were led out of their kennel and sent with security details to the center of the city. Not one incident of biting has been verified. This is also something Shakhanov must have known.

Now with respect to the engineer shovels and tarpaulin boots, in hundreds of stories of illnesses that were reviewed, which were recorded in the words of the patients, there was not one word about shovels. Let us assume that they were afraid to declare this, in order not to indicate their presence on the square. But even the nature of the injuries does not corroborate Shakhanov's version.

In order to write these few lines, we did a tremendous amount of work. Shakhanov, talking about this at the congress, did not familiarize himself in advance with even one objective medical document. The one thing that he was right about is that it was not drug addicts and it was not alcoholics who came to the square in December of 1986. Not one of the injured who underwent examination was found to have narcotic substances and alcohol in the blood.

Nevertheless, 3 weeks after his speech, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the republic decided to establish a commission which was instructed to investigate the December events. The commission was headed by K.G. Murzaliyev, a poet and a member of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet. The commission consisted of prominent lawyers, journalists, writers, and production workers. The commission was granted the right to familiarize itself with documents with any level of security classification, to investigate any and the most delicate circumstances, and to meet with any people on the territory of the republic and beyond its borders. But by 19 July, that is, after another 3 weeks had passed, M. Shakhanov asks for the floor at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the very same question and declares: "As I see it, the republic commission is pursuing the objective of blocking the creation of a commission that is not subordinate to republic leadership... In my opinion, the republic commission is not able to evaluate the December tragedy objectively..." He further requested a vote on the creation of a commission from among the members of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR.

The situation has become so tense that to oppose the pressure of Shakhanov meant to admit that he was right. And the commission that was established earlier was immediately shored up with seven USSR People's Deputies from Kazakhstan. Shakhanov joins the commission in the role of its co-chairman. But we note: From the very first days of work, he supervises the investigation practically single-handedly.

However, it seemed to Shakhanov that investing two-tenths of the members of the commission with the highest authority was inadequate. He insists on the formation of a large group of volunteer assistants. And credentials for deputy forms are being handed out to more than 200 lawyers, mainly former and simply socially active persons. Their bearers have the right to demand any information of interest to them from any department and establishment of the republic.

To this very moment, Shakhanov does not have the slightest idea who these more than 200 persons are. But they did not establish anything that would contradict official data that was presented by the authorities. Although the temporary members of the commission displayed a lot of enthusiasm, especially in the search for victims. Former demonstrators told us that the voluntary investigators persistently demanded that they give at least some information concerning the "December

corpses," and about where it was possible to get hold of at least one more innocent victim.

Moreover, the commission rejected and sidestepped the main demands of the participants of the December events—to examine the question of their political rehabilitation. Because they continue to carry the insulting stigma of "Kazakh nationalists and drug addicts." But, perhaps, Shakhanov's voluntary helpers were concerned about one thing—to prove that in December 1986 the republic almost choked on blood. In order that, later, after erecting a pedestal of "innocent victims," to broadcast from it the cover-up of the truth and to spread the seeds of discord.

On 14 November of this year, the Supreme Soviet of the republic, having heard the report of the findings of the commission, which was headed by K.G. Murzaliyev and M. Shakhanov, deemed it necessary to render an evaluation of its work and to state that the commission, as was stated in the decree, "did not confirm the rumors that were circulated about numerous victims."

Thank God that the parliament of the republic had the common sense to interrupt this marathon for "innocent victims."

There was enough courage and responsibility to request the CPSU Central to do away with the wording "manifestation of Kazakh nationalism" in the evaluation of the events that took place on 17-18 December 1986 in Alma-Ata, which was given in a decree of the CPSU Central Committee regarding these events. We, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA journalists, having investigated all of the facts in the affair, however modest our voice, join the parliament in this request.

We admit that, working on the material, we wanted to end the finale with caustic social and political journalism on the subject of the political morality of the deputies, about the tremendous responsibility that lay on the shoulders of the elected representatives, about the fact that their one careless word uttered in a fit of temper, or that simply was not justified, could evoke an avalanche of passions.

But afterwards we had doubts: Is it necessary to talk in detail about a fact that we have already experienced more than once in the short history of our democratic changes.?

We would like in the end to introduce a certain portion of optimism, to express the confidence that the bitter December will never be repeated, and that we must really learn in the end to derive lessons from what has been experienced!

But in one of the small rooms of one of the student residence halls we are talking with members of the informal association "December" ("Zheltoksan" in Kazakh), which gathered mainly youth in its ranks. What does "Zheltoksan" want? An expansion of democratic changes, an honest election campaign of candidates for people's deputies, full rehabilitation of all former political demonstrators (the accent is on "political", and criminal acts committed by some demonstrators in the square 3 years ago do not fall under rehabilitation), the development of national culture, freedom of assembly... On the whole, nothing that could be categorized as an attempt to shake the foundations of our socialist state.

But society is not being recorded. Moreover, a representative of the obkom [oblast party committee] came to the residence hall the other day and warned the "Decembrists": If you assemble anywhere without being authorized—you alone are to blame. The "Decembrists" said in response—come to us, listen to what we talk about, let even a representative of the KGB come with you, we do not make a secret of anything. The obkom representative shrugged his shoulders: "I warned you," and he left.

Well, what is this? Where did this relapse into stagnation come from?! Because it does not matter if people assemble and talk. We all talk. If we do not talk openly, we will again begin to fear the knock on the door, and sometime once again it will get cold and December will arrive, despite the fact that the weather bureau will assure us that it is warm outside.

Yakovlev Interviewed on Past Political Trials

LD0401125290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—Aleksandr Yakovlev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has spoken out in favor of the general rehabilitation of those convicted by the political trials of the past in the USSR. In an interview with the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, he spoke about the prospects for the activity of the Politburo commission, headed by him, on the additional study of materials connected with the repression that took place in the period of the thirties and forties, and at the beginning of the fifties. "One must also display fairness and mercy with regard to all the people who were subjected to repressions for political reasons," it is stated in the interview. "Fairness with regard to those who were innocently repressed—this applies to the overwhelming majority of them. And mercy for those who have committed a sin before society, who have perhaps committed criminal acts. But this happened in certain conditions; it was an emotional or some kind of response to the lawlessness with which a person could not agree. It seems to me that a general declaration like this is completely acceptable and would correspond to the moral atmosphere of our days."

Replying to a question about guarantees that there would not be a return to the criminal methods of past years, Aleksandr Yakovlev stressed: "The only way is democracy, nation-wide control of power over the activity of any person who has been placed in power. This means a specified procedure for passing laws. This means maximum glasnost in all spheres. A microbe of arbitrariness, a microbe of dictatorship always lives where there is no

glasnost, in the absence of democracy." At the same time, the exceptional importance of healthy moral principles in society is noted in the interview. "Hitler came to power," he recalls, "on the basis of nation-wide voting." But together with this formal expression of democratic principles, profound immorality triumphed: There was national enmity and the poisoning of a nation with ideas of exclusiveness. Therefore, when I talk about guarantees that the past will not be repeated, I always add: Moral democracy, democracy that draws support from sound human morality and conscience.

KGB Chief on Need for Social Stability, Unity

LD0401143390 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 4 TASS—Unity is a major condition for stability. It is what Soviet society needs today, Soviet Communist Party Politburo Member and KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov said in an interview published in the latest issue of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

"As a representative of law-enforcement bodies, I would like to emphasise the rule of law and the need to abide by laws," Kryuchkov said.

"The complexity of modern life is impossible without this basis. Everyone should think about this, because otherwise we won't end arbitrariness, violence and anarchy.

"We are alarmed by the state of our economy, ethnic relations and the morals of a society going through a transition. The list of our problems continues. They might have roots in our past, but they require urgent solutions.

"The twelve day session of the recent Congress of People's Deputies was a search for answers to many of our why's. We did not search in vain.

"I believe the Congress provided ways out of the crisis, ways that are basically correct and set prudent short-term objectives. I place my hopes on this belief. We should now become wiser and more prudent and avoid hasty conclusions and decisions.

"There are reasons to hope that, despite our current social problems and ethnic tensions, we will become more patient of each other and listen and respect each other.

"As for my plans as head of the KGB, I would like to say that we will continue to promote perestroyka in our work. To be more concrete—we will expand democracy and openness in our work, step up the fight against organised crime and expand our contact with the people and the deputies.

"All Soviet people should understand the necessity of what we are doing—the Committee on state Security has no interests other than the interests of the people."

Bulgarian Paper's Interview

AU0101125090 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 22 Dec 89 p 2

[Tsveta Kenerdzhieva report: "KGB Under Fire of Female Journalists' Questions"]

[Text] This meeting had to take place. By this I mean the unusually high journalistic interest toward the personality of our interlocutor, Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB. Until recently he was practically unknown to the wide "public," which is understandable. A close associate of Yuriy Andropov, for 12 years he was the leader of Soviet intelligence.

On the eve of the holiday—the anniversary of the Soviet state security organs—we, female mass media representatives of more than 20 countries, members of the widely known International "33+1" Female Press Club, were for more than 5 hours the guests of the KGB.

After thoroughly reviewing the Museum of Soviet Chekists and a part of the KGB complex in the very center of Moscow—in the square and street named after Feliks Dzerzhinskiy, we met the 65-year old Vladimir Kryuchkov, KGB chief and member of the higher Soviet leadership, in the hall for collegium meetings.

I shall describe some of the "secrets" that were published for the first time, but let me start with the question posed by the OTECHESTVEN FRONT correspondent:

[Question] Recently the KGB has been most actively participating in eliminating the "white fields" in history. Shall we learn soon more details about the total political rehabilitation of the Bulgarian emigrants, who have been repressed in the USSR, as well as the whole truth about the "trials" that were staged?

[Kryuchkov] The repressions of the 1930's against Communists from various countries, who had found refuge in the USSR, represent one of the most dramatic pages in the history of the world communist movement. This sad list of Stalinism's victims also contains Bulgarian pages. Many of the Bulgarian political emigrants, who lived and worked in the USSR, have been repressed, including Krustyo Rakovski and Roman Avramov, secretaries of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, and others. At the instruction of the commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the KGB and its local organs are carefully working toward clarifying all circumstances related to the period of mass repressions, including establishing the facts surrounding the fate of every Bulgarian political emigrant who has perished during that period in the USSR without any guilt on his part, and rehabilitating him. We have preliminary information on about 203 people, and they have been rehabilitated. We continue our work.

After answering my question Vladimir Kryuchkov made the following statement, which directly relates to allowing access to the archives of the People's Commissariat on Internal Affairs (NKVD), and the Ministry of

State Security (MGB): "The issue of declassifying the state and departmental archives is being reviewed now in connection with the working out of the law on USSR archives. I hope that in the near future the draft of this law will be submitted to the Supreme Soviet. As far as opening the archives related to the mass repressions of 1937 and 1938 is concerned, we were required to publish archive material about the most important political trials of that time in the IZVESTIYA magazine of the CPSU Central Committee. During the current year alone, more than 1,100 articles based on documents of the state security organs' archives have been published in the press, and 305 radio and television programs related to the rehabilitation of the victims of Stalinist repressions have been prepared. I can cite the following specific example—one of your female historians reviewed materials in our archives about Krustyo Rakovski, who was repressed in 1937."

Naturally, under the "fire" of 33 journalists our interlocutor was forced to use not only the iron logic of the facts, but also his sense of humor, gentleman-like attitude, and the pleasant (for us, professional journalists) inclination to impart much information that was unknown to us.

"It is well known that you are curious people who want to know everything. You ask me about the service of women in the security organs. There really are such departments in the Chekist activity, where women, with their characteristic precision, insistence, and stamina can and do successfully resolve their tasks. The purely female intuition—a sense men do not understand—helps them in many cases, and this is amazing. I would not like to insult you—women can keep a secret precisely as a man can. You will agree with me that this fact has a meaning in the security organs....

"I was asked whether I can make a unique "present" to your club and tell you facts that are not known by the journalists.

"From our personal experience of associating with journalists we have the impression that because of their professional curiosity, they always know a bit more than their interlocutor. Thus perhaps you could give me some information, and I as a "present" shall clarify its authenticity. Well, if we are talking seriously, let me cite some numerical information, that has not been published until now"

"Women represent 14% of all military employees and workers of the state security. They are 30% of the employees of the KGB central apparatus and 25% of the local organs.

"Some 94% of the female officers have higher education. Some 21% of our female employees hold the degree of candidate of science, and three quarters know foreign languages.

"Some two thirds of our female employees are younger than 40 years, while 17% are younger than 30.

"Many of our female employees have been awarded with orders and medals, and I think that soon there will be a female KGB general."

The reflections of the KGB chairman about the modern image of the Chekists, prompted by our interest, became a natural continuation of the conversation.

The average age of a KGB employee today is 36-37—this is an age that still offers many possibilities, and yet, at the same time they already have sufficient professional and life experience.

The only privilege the Chekists have is their responsibility for the fate of the people. Their jobs involve working day and night, without rest or holidays, often without leave, and without any relaxation. They always are alert....

Our lively conversation in the house on Dzerzhinskiy Street No. 1 already lasted more than 4 hours. The informal atmosphere and the comfort created by the flowers we received, did not detract our attention from important issues such as relations between the KGB and the CPSU, the new political thinking, expanding the sphere of cooperation with special Western services, especially the CIA, KGB's cooperation with the "Memorial" Organization in fully unmasking the crimes of Stalinism, does the end of the Cold War mean that the KGB will have less work, do the concept of dissident and political prisoner still exist for the KGB, what are the KGB budget and payroll, and who is the fifth Soviet resident in England after the legendary Kim Philby....

After this mosaic of open and real secrets I would like to stress an especially topical and alarming issue—the struggle against organized crime.

—We think, the KGB chairman said, that this struggle must have great scope and active character, however, the main thing is to remove the causes that produce organized crime, and this is not the job of the law and order organs only. The success in this are depends on uniting the efforts of the law and order organs with the efforts of society.

Activities of Special Militia Unit Cited

90UN0464A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 p 3

[Unattributed article: "OMON in Action"]

[Text] Twenty-five thousand rock-n-roll lovers gathered recently in the "Olimpiyskiy" sports complex. Being excited by the music and, in some cases, by alcohol that they had drunk before the concert, the young people ran berserk and started to take their clothes off, to climb onto the stage and, in general, create an uproar. They could be calmed down only with the help of the OMON [special purpose militia units].

The OMON was created a little over a year ago. As its main task it is required not only to safeguard the public

order at meetings, demonstrations and various performances, but also to help in detaining armed criminals.

Yesterday OMON members gave a press conference in the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. At the press conference they showed their equipment to the journalists: Bullet-proof vests, a sniper rifle, a submachine-gun, rubber truncheons, and a special gun for spraying the agent "Cheryemukha" which, unfortunately, is employed rather often.

During this one year OMON provided security at concerts and sports meets more than 200 times. It helped to detain more than 23,000 lawbreakers, including 139 criminals.

Close to 5,000,000 people took part in 324 meetings and demonstrations in the capital. Of these, 209 had not been approved. The OMON units also safeguarded public order at voters meetings with people's deputies.

A similar unit is operational in Moscow Oblast. More than 90 times it was sent to catch dangerous criminals. It helped to arrest a group of racketeers from whom they confiscated 7 home-made explosive devices, about 2,000 cartridges, knives and fire-arms, and more than R30,000. In the city of Naro- Fominsk they arrested a criminal armed with a machinegun.

USSR Procuracy Holds Meeting on Racketeering

90UN0494A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by G.Ovcharenko "In the USSR Procuracy"]

[Text] Just a few years ago, when people heard about a racket many of them would reach for a foreign language dictionary. Today extortion under the threat of violence has become one of the terrifying features of our society. In 1986 1,665 cases of such crimes were recorded, but already 2,424 of these cases have been seen in just the first 6 months of this year. And we must remember that many victims of the racketeers do not report the crimes to the police.

These were the data given yesterday at the coordinating meeting for the chiefs of the law enforcement organs which took place at the USSR Procuracy. The information was provided by V. Kravtsev, Deputy Procurator General of the USSR. At present, "racketeers" means a stable group of criminals who have in their possession cars, weapons, and money. Very often former or active law enforcement officers become members.

Here is just one example. In Donest Oblast a gang was active for 2 years, committing burglaries and assaults that often ended in premeditated murder. The local law enforcement officials took all possible measures to apprehend the brutal racketeers, but they could not be caught. As it turned out, the gang was headed by the operations commissioner of the Criminal Investigations Department under the Administration of Internal Affairs of the Donetsk Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee], V. Konovalov. At the trial he received the death penalty.

As it was mentioned at the meeting by the chief of one of the departments of the USSR Procuracy, A.Nikolayev, that there is no definite strategy or tactics for fighting an organized group of racketeers, there is no interaction which is so vital among the law enforcement organs. It is known from practice that the original contacts of the future racketeers are established in detention centers. But there are very poor business contacts between the operations officials and the personnel of the correction-and-labor colonies. So, it is no mere chance that many of the convicts, after they serve their time, go to organize steady criminal groups.

The participants of the meeting also discussed how to improve legislation aimed at fighting the problem of drugs. In this respect, it was decided to send an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A number of people's deputies were invited to the USSR Procuracy. They could have learned a lot of useful information at the coordinating meeting, especially since after the official part of the meeting a very animated "roundtable" on that very problem took place. Scientists, operations officials and journalists all joined it, but the deputies did not acknowledge the invitation.

The materials of the meeting that took place yesterday at the USSR Procuracy and the recommendations resulting from it will help to further improve criminal legislation; they will contribute to a better organization of the practical work in the law enforcement offices.

New RSFSR Internal Affairs Head Interviewed

90UN0556A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with V. Trushin, minister of the new RSFSR MVD, by correspondent A. Urvantsev: "The Ministry Starts Out...."]

[Text] [Urvantsev] Vasiliy Petrovich, the Ministry is currently taking shape and its organization began with the appointment of the minister. That the choice rested on you was no accident, evidently?

[Trushin] You see, for 5 years prior to this I had been first deputy minister of internal affairs of the USSR and was in charge of the work of the Russian services. The affairs and concerns of Russia are close and dear to me.

[Urvantsev] The formation of a new MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] is obviously a requirement of the times?

[Trushin] I will say definitely that this is no game of the apparatus and no apical restructuring, but a profoundly considered step for shaking up the Russian internal affairs subdivisions to combat the growing crime and improve the situation in the republic.

It is well known that new types of offenses have now emerged: Racketeering and organized crime with regional and interregional connections. We are obliged with regard to this to restructure our work. The independence of each union republic is now increasing under the conditions of regional cost accounting and self-financing. Nor can Russia be an exception here. It is primarily a question of strengthening its state mechanism. Henceforth, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] will have, figuratively speaking, its own quartet of law enforcement bodies working here: Court of law, procuracy, justice, and MVD.

[Urvantsev] Will your Ministry differ from its union counterpart in terms of its structure?

[Trushin] Its structure is still being worked up as of now, but there will undoubtedly be such historically evolved basic services as the criminal investigation department, the office for combating embezzlement of socialist property and speculation, and the investigative authorities in the Russian MVD. Of course, new forms of administration will emerge also. This way, Russia has its own particular features: The distinctiveness of the economic, social, and cultural development of vast regions, diversity of the ethnic composition of the population—all this prompts us to seek individual approaches to the administration of the MVD authorities in respect to a specific region and autonomous republic. That is, linkage of the work of the subdivisions of a number of regions has become urgent and problematical for us right now.

A specific expression of such an approach will be the creation of regional councils from the ranks of leaders of the internal affairs authorities of krays and oblasts which are a part of this region or the other. The councils could be headed by members of the RSFSR MVD Board. Such formations could produce results in the field of strengthening the subdivisions' interaction and the exchange of experience in the fight against crime. I believe that they will play a positive role in preventing excesses in the soil of exacerbation of interethnic relations. [sentence as published]

[Urvantsev] What about jurisdiction?

[Trushin] I shall say definitely that it is not some exclusive department which is being formed. The Russian MVD will be an organic part of the union Ministry and, like all the republic internal affairs authorities, will have dual subordination: To the Russian Council of Ministers and the USSR MVD.

[Urvantsev] Will the formation of the new Ministry help, in your view, to stabilize the effective situation in the republic and reduce the growth of crime?

[Trushin] I do not believe that the formation of any structures, the MVD included, would in itself entail an immediate drop in offenses. Although, I repeat, the entire activity of the new ministry will be geared to the solution of precisely this problem. Crime is a multifactor phenomenon. The basis thereof are factors of an economic, social, and moral-ethnical nature. They are formed and exist within society.

[Urvantsev] In a word, we need to make a thorough study of the objective causes of the rise in crime?

[Trushin] Precisely. The illness will not pass of its own accord. Let us take the so-called shadow economy, about which much is being said currently. V.A. Bakatin's report at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies on an intensification of the fight against organized crime emphasized that it represents an exceptional danger to society and that its nutrient medium has become the shadow economy developing in the country on the basis of lax management, large-scale embezzlement, and profiteering. Why are there clandestine works producing this commodity or the other? There are many shortages in state trade, and goods cannot always be acquired even on the market. There has been an increase, for example, in instances of the theft of automobile glass. There is just one reason: It is not to be found anywhere, and on the black market its price is five or six times higher than the official price. The industry manufacturing these products is to blame for the shortage, but the larceny percentage in police statistical accountability, however, has gone up.

The new structure—the RSFSR MVD—will conduct an uncompromising struggle against organized crime with interregional connections and outlets overseas in close interaction with the KGB authorities. In the fight against corruption particularly, there are already many examples of KGB subdivisions rendering effective assistance in the exposure of corrupt elements.

Of course, rectifying the economic and social causes of offenses is far more complex, but this is the highway. Competent and qualified people are needed to combat underground syndicates and organized crime successfully.

[Urvantsev] We have approached the problem of personnel. The divisional inspector is obviously a pivotal figure here....

[Trushin] I agree, but with the correction that in the business of crime prevention he is truly the key figure. The restructuring in the work of the divisional inspectors under current conditions was initiated by the USSR Council of Ministers decree on measures pertaining to the further improvement of the work of the divisional police inspectors and an improvement in their material support. There have already been certain results. Thus the numbers of the service have increased considerably, and a whole number of normative documents regulating its work has been adopted. The RSFSR MVD will concern itself with the further improvement of the activity of this service also, specifically, with an improvement in the qualitative composition of the inspector personnel.

[Urvantsev] Nonetheless, there are many complaints about the work of the divisional inspectors....

[Trushin] I agree. Not that many inspectors are qualified lawyers with higher education, and the service is understaffed. Three USSR MVD higher schools, two of them in Russia, have been inaugurated for improvement in inspector training.

[Urvantsev] I shall cite personal experience. In the past 10 years I have seen my divisional inspector on only one occasion. Then only because I had had a new collapsible bicycle stolen.

[Trushin] A correct observation. Divisional inspectors in some precincts are still frequently used to perform the assignments and commissions of other police services which are unconnected with service of the precinct directly and with work with the population. A daily link with people should be the basis of their entire crime-prevention work. Simply put, they are obliged to serve the population. The work schedule of the Russian MVD will incorporate the following assignment also—lowering the population size service quota per divisional inspector. It is currently as follows: In an urban locality, up to 5,000 persons; in a rural locality, up to 4,000 persons.

Now, in connection with the humanization of legislation, additional concerns will be borne by such a service and the inspectors for juvenile affairs. According to the figures of the law enforcement authorities, there are 1.5 million persons released from places of confinement and removed from the register of the special warden's offices alone. This increased burden on the inspectors will also be taken into consideration during the formation of a crime-prevention service in the Ministry.

In professional terms, the crime-prevention contingent will include not only persons indicted under criminal law, but also those who are leading an incorrect way of life: Drug addicts, prostitutes, spongers, people abusing hard liquor, and disaffected adolescents. Some 920,000 of the latter are registered currently. There are approximately 6 million persons who, judging by their criminogenic propensities or antisocial behavior, may be expected to commit a crime. It is essential that the inspectors perform individual work with each of them.

[Urvantsev] In terms of its territory and its dimensions Russia is a huge republic. The unmaintained state of its numerous country roads and highways and minor roads is our common pain and problem. The vast majority of rural detectives, however, are provided with a single form of transport—the motorcycle. Can an inspector catch up with offenders in a "Zhiguli?"

[Trushin] Many enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective farms and state farms] also are now suggesting that we maintain divisional inspectors at their expense.

[Urvantsev] Are we talking about a municipal police force?

[Trushin] To a certain extent, yes. The large-scale enterprises are allocating not only money but also transport for the needs of the police. Thus the auto works in Togliatti is furnishing the municipal police with motor vehicles which it itself has made. Society is beginning to understand increasingly that there will be no big change in the situation and no halting the growth of crime if things are left to the internal affairs authorities alone.

[Urvantsev] The GAI [State Automobile Inspectorate] has many problems also. The motor pool is in a calamitous situation in some precincts—there is a shortage of gasoline, and spares are obtained heaven knows how....

[Trushin] I would be more specific: GAI workers obtain spares in ways known only to them. Indeed, we are today short, as they say, of the scheduled transport authorization in the GAI subdivisions. All this is very disturbing to the Union Ministry also, and we in the republic will encounter such issues. Next year we will be allocated twice as many motor vehicles as last year. Gasoline supplies will be increased also.

There is another side to this question also—we need to exploit better the hardware that we have. But discussion is at times in a single direction—give us more of it! It is often the case that on account of lax management and mistreatment an automobile and other equipment quickly become unusable. It has to be remembered that any vehicle received by the police comes from the state budget.

More serious than ever currently is the question of the retooling of the internal affairs authorities. We lag considerably behind our colleagues from the developed countries here. We are in dire need of modern computers. The USSR State Committee for Computer Technology and Information Science is catering only 35% of our requirements, however.

[Urvantsev] What is the effective situation in Russia currently?

[Trushin] As of today, very complex. To go by the statistics, crime of practically all types is growing everywhere. A serious criminological situation has arisen in Maritime Kray, the Tuva ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and Rostov and Ulyanovsk Oblasts. In the Russian Federation an extremely inauspicious situation has come about in connection with the safeguarding of sales outlets, particularly in such oblasts as Kamchatka, Tambov, Astrakhan, and Kursk.

[Urvantsev] What worries you most currently as a minister?

[Trushin] Many crimes remain unsolved. They have increased by a factor of 2.1. Five thousand additional permanent investigators are currently being brought into the MVD system. Some of them will work in the Russian MVD also. New subdivisions for fighting organized

crime have been created also. The most experienced officers are being sent to this service.

Registration of RSFSR Deputies Candidates Begins

LD0301181490 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 3 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov:

The registration of candidates for people's deputies started today in the Russian Federation, the biggest of the 15 union republics of the USSR. The first meetings of candidates with voters will be held tomorrow. The elections, as is known, are to be held on March 4.

As many as 5,441 candidates have been nominated. They will compete for 1,068 seats, Anatoliy Petrov, secretary of the central electoral committee for the election of people's deputies in the Russian Federation, told TASS. On an average five candidates will compete for every mandate.

Petrov said that meetings in work collectives and in constituencies, at which the candidates were discussed, were held in the atmosphere of openness, in the spirit of democratisation of social life.

There were some shortcomings, certainly. In some constituencies nominations were made when the allotted time for nomination almost expired. Some public organisations, specifically the Komsomol and women's councils were not very active.

According to the law on election, the district electoral committees publish not later than on the fourth day after the candidates' registration a report on the registration summing up the biographies of the candidates. Then the canvassing will start.

It can easily be predicted that the election campaign will be marked by greater participation of masses of the people in the political life, by their striving to elect to the supreme body of authority of the Russian Federation the worthiest people, capable of solving the tasks encountered by the republic in a new way, in the spirit of perestroika, Petrov said.

The Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation consisting of 1,068 people will be formed on the results of the elections. The permanent bicameral parliament, the Supreme Soviet of the republic, will be elected from deputies of the congress.

Komsomol Central Committee Bureau Meets

PM2912165189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 89 p 1

[Komsomol Central Committee Press Group report: "In the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau"]

[Text] It was noted in the resolution "On the Results of the All-Union Student Forum" jointly adopted by the collegium of the USSR State Committee for Public Education and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Secretariat, that the forum had provided an opportunity for direct dialogue between students and the country's top leadership, that a step had been taken along the path to consolidating progressive student forces, and it further exposed the reasons for social tension in higher education institutes and technical schools.

Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Committees, organs of public education, leaders of educational institutes, and trade union committees are instructed to profoundly analyze the forum's decisions, and adopt measures for their implementation.

The Bureau discussed the draft resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU, and the Komsomol Central Committee "On further measures for improving the material and everyday conditions of students and young people in education," which takes into consideration the ideas and proposals of the forum's delegates.

Support was given to the forum's proposal to create a USSR student fund for assistance to very needy students, supporting socially significant initiatives, and extending the infrastructure for future specialists' everyday life, recreation, and travel.

The publishing of an all-union student newspaper, which would become the tribune of student public opinion and express the diversity of interests and points of view of the future intelligentsia regarding the processes taking place in society, waa examined.

A plan of practical measures for the implementation of the forum's delegates' proposals was approved.

The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau adopted a decision to form a Komsomol Central Committee Student Commission which includes students and postgraduate students who have taken an active part in preparing and holding the forum and Komsomol workers.

The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau in the main agreed with the principles of reorganizing the Komsomol Central Committee student detachments' central headquarters, and supported the proposals on holding a conference of student detachments' social formations and other forms of enterprising labor.

The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau examined certain questions regarding the preparation for the 21st Komsomol Congress and a number of other questions.

Border Guards Study Buryat Language

90UN0296A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by Colonel V. Kovalev, correspondent of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: "Border Guards Study Buryat Language"]

[Text] The editors of the newspaper for the Transbaykal Border District, POGRANICHNIK ZABAYKALYA [Transbaykal Border Guard], have begun to give their readers lessons in the Buryat language. S. Budayev, doctor of philology, is conducting them.

"These lessons will help the border guards in this district who are serving on Buryat territory to master the elements of the Buryat language, and this means that the ties of friendship binding the local population to the soldiers in green caps will become stronger," says the newspaper's deputy editor, Col. Ye. Kachev. "Without a doubt, this will allow us to better carry out the tasks of a reliable protection of the Motherland's borders, as well. Incidentally, our readers have responded to the newspaper's undertaking with approval. At frontier posts, study circles for the Buryat language are being formed. We hope that our publications will serve them as a good teaching and methodical source."

Border guards in the district also serve on the territory of the Tuva ASSR. The editors intend to introduce the rubric "Learn to Speak Tuva" on the pages of POGRANICHNIK ZABAYKALYA in the near future. Besides language lessons, the newspaper regularly publishes materials that tell about the customs and traditions of the Buryat and Tuva peoples.

Deputies' Club Appeal Supports Perestroyka

90UN0556E Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 52, 27 Dec 89 p 4

[USSR People's Deputies' Club appeal: "Pivotal Moment"]

[Text] Recent events prompt us to appeal to all USSR people's deputies and the country's entire public opinion. We refer primarily to the attacks on the eve of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the policy of perestroyka, glasnost, democratization, and the formation of a new, humane society open to the whole world.

Certain figures, manifestly intimidated by the coming face-to-face meeting with the people at the time of the election campaigns for the republic and local soviets, are accusing the leadership of failing to guarantee their automatic election. They are saying repeatedly that we are taking the wrong road and talking about the danger of the breakup of the country and the socialist world. They are attempting to direct the discontent and the particular disenchantment connected with the difficulties of perestroyka toward those who boldly initiated the struggle against stagnation and for a radical reconstruction of society which has been recognized by the Soviet people and all mankind.

Political strikes could objectively play into the hands of such forces. There is a logic of events, a logic of the escalation of conflicts. It is important to see not only the first step, but the entire chain of subsequent steps. Such actions could only rock the boat of perestroyka and sow the spirit of intolerance and confrontation which formed the basis and served as the main tool of Stalinism. Whereas even some people are pulling us back to the times of stagnation and mass repression, others—their good intentions notwithstanding—are pushing us toward senseless rebellion, which also contains a danger of a toughening of political conditions.

An historic moment has now arrived in the fortunes of perestroyka, in the fortunes of the country. Each politically active person is faced with a choice: What to do and where to go and whom to follow, for it is not only a question in politics of what the ideas are but also of who the leader capable of implementing them is.

It is our profound conviction that we need to continue to moved forward more consistently and purposefully by rallying all supporters of reforms around the policy of perestroyka.

The congresses of USSR people's deputies and the two sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet have already initiated real movement along this path. A whole set of laws on a mixed economy, pluralism in political life, and human rights and liberties has been or is being prepared. We need to consolidate these gains of perestroyka and step by step, firmly and consistently enact new laws and change economic and legal policy, freeing labor and ensuring a worthy life for each family and each individual and, ultimately, the prosperity of all of society.

For this, it is necessary to overcome resistance at all levels and accelerate the promotion of reformers to state and industrial management positions. The renewal of the party, the restoration of its socialist and democratic foundations, the complete emancipation of ideology from the shackles of authoritarian communism, and the use of the best achievements of world civilization are essential.

We call on the USSR people's deputies and all the country's public forces to concentrate efforts on constructive work to solve the urgent problems of the life of the people—provisioning food and the surmounting the commodity and housing shortage and the poverty and destitution of certain strata of society and urgent ecological problems. We call on the representatives of various interests, currents, and opinions, without sacrificing their positions, to learn to listen to one another, accept all that is the best, whoever expresses it, and seek and find what unites society, and not what divides it.

We call on people to consolidate in support of perestroyka and the policy of its initiator and leader lawfully elected by us all—USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman M.S. Gorbachev—to give him real authority to make important operational decisions, to help him overcome resistance, to correct his policy and to exercise real supervision of the activity of the executive.

We call on Soviet people, representatives of formal and informal movements, and all to whom the cause of struggle for our renewal and a better life is dear to display popular commonsense, not succumb to the provocations

of demagogues, and to understand that all the country's most acute problems may be solved only on the paths of perestroyka, and not in defiance of it, and only in an atmosphere of civil peace. May a spirit of consolidation, revolutionary restructuring, political wisdom, and high responsibility for the fate of the motherland triumph in all our activity.

[Signed] Members of the USSR People's Deputies' Club: S. Alekseyev, N. Amosov, A. Aydak, Metropolitan Aleksey, A. Ananyev, F. Burlatskiy, P. Bunich, B. Velikhov, A. Vladislavlev, D. Granin, I. Gryazin, A. Denisov, A. Yemelyanov, N. Neyland, A. Plotniyeks, K. Prunskene, A. Sobchak, S. Fedorov, N. Shmelev, Yu. Shcherbak, V. Yarin.

Urals Deputies Unite To Push Issues

90UN0556C Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report on interview with groups of deputies' members by V. Abramov: "Working in Unison"]

[Text] A group of deputies. This word combination is only just becoming a part of our parliamentary vocabulary but, as can be seen from practice, becoming a part quite confidently. More so in that the recently confirmed standing orders of the congress are entirely in agreement with this form of deputies' cooperation.

V. Shmotyev, a worker from Sverdlovsk and executive director of the Urals Center of Deputies:

"Our center includes approximately half the Urals deputies. We have decided to act together to achieve more quickly an improvement in life in the two autonomous republics and six oblasts of the Urals. Things are bad here ecologically; working people's labor and social life is not all that well organized and there are problems concerning production modernization. Generally, the members of the Urals Center of Deputies have work to do.

"Initially much effort was expended on bringing the Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee's initiative concerning the oblast's transition to financial autonomy to the point of specific results. This transition will evidently take place in 1991. This work was for us a 'running test,' as it were. We are pleased that some good has come of it."

V. Yermakov, chairman of the Russian Consumer Cooperatives Society Board, is joining a group of deputies from consumer cooperative societies:

"Our group is at the formation stage as yet, although consumer cooperative society officials who are deputies have gotten together earlier from time to time. Understandably, the group is necessary for more effective parliamentary work. We are obliged to defend the interests of millions of our shareholders both here, in the congress, and at sessions of the Supreme Soviet. This will be easier now that we have united our efforts."

Pamyat Organizer Medvedev On Trial

90UN0464D Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 1 Dec 89 p 3

[Text] **Court and "Pamyat".** V Medvedev, people's judge of the Leninskiy Rayon court postponed the hearing of I. Sychev's administrative case until 7 December due to the defendant's illness. The police produced evidence that he violated the regulations on the organization and conduct of meetings, street rallies, and demonstrations.

The Moscovite ispolkom [city soviet executive committee] gave to I. Sychev and the "Pamyat" movement permission to lay flowers at the monument to Minin and Pozharskiy in the Red Square. The action was meant to commemorate the anniversary of liberation of Moscow from the Polish troops in 1612. However, the approved action grew into a meeting. If I. Sychev is found responsible for the event, he might have to pay a fine of up to R1,000 or undergo administrative detention for 15 days or he might be sentenced to 1 to 2 months of forced labor and confiscation of 20% of his salary.

Supreme Soviet Privileges Commission Function Viewed

90UN0495A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Ella Aleksandrovna Pamfilova, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Privileges Commission, by V. Dolganov: "Justice or Leveling?"; date and place not given]

[Text] Each of us probably remembers how complicated and sometimes stormy the debate on concessions and privileges was at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. People are rightly indignant that some enjoy "back door" benefits by turning their office chair into a unique kind of feeding trough.

What is being done to eliminate these phenomena, which are incompatible with the aims of perestroyka? How will the principles of social justice be restored? Have any concrete shifts been made now, today?

This is the subject of our correspondent's interview with people's deputy Ella Aleksandrovna Pamfilova, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission on the privileges that particular categories of citizens enjoy.

[Dolganov] For a long time virtually nothing was heard about the work of your commission. Our readers even became so worried that they started to ask in letters and telephone calls whether "the apparatus is putting pressure on the commission because it is reluctant to give up unlawful privileges and benefits?"

What can you tell us about this?

[Pamfilova] First of all, on the absurdity of the accusations made against the commission: All 28 deputies who are working in it are people of principle, are being led by no one and are quite independent. Including the chairman, Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov. Right

from the start the commission has not wasted any time, although I admit that our work has not been simple.

The danger existed that we would become an appendage of the investigating organs or the organs of people's control: For example, we were receiving signals and then rushing to verify them. There was no shortage of letters raising the alarm. We are being presented with a mass of questions. For example, why does a general's daughter go to the airport with her father without any examination while a war invalid has to go through a preflight check? Why are particular categories of citizens privileged to enroll in a VUZ [higher educational institution]? And there are many thousands of indignant letters in the mail to the Supreme Soviet on the subjects of dachas, personal cars, specially rationed commodities and so forth.

Ultimately we managed to define our task precisely: It is necessary to draw up a principled policy and specific recommendations to eradicate privileges and unjustified benefits. The commission split up into working groups for the main directions, which cover virtually all spheres of life—public health, sanatoria and resorts treatment, housing, trade, culture, everyday life, transport, pensions. It is the privileges here for particular categories that cause the greatest social tension.

We started with public health and an analysis of the status in pediatric health. You are aware of the results of this work: On the direct recommendation of the commission the USSR Government instruction of 31 August went into general use in all children's treatment and sanatoria institutions falling within the jurisdiction of the USSR Ministry of Health Fourth Main Administration. Simultaneously, also at our proposal, the USSR Council of Ministers recommended that all union republic councils of ministers take similar steps. Here, a categorical demand was made: The material support, system of wages for workers and calculated norms for spending on food and drugs existing at the moment of transfer should be retained in the transferred institutions.

Then the government adopted yet another recommendation, namely, to eliminate the USSR Ministry of Health Fourth Main Administration before 1 January 1990. The earlier practice whereby some of the allocations made for general public health were used to finance the Fourth Main Administration was the one that evoked the greatest criticism. It was essential to put an end to this practice, and we have.

Naturally, it was not a question of forbidding various enterprises, institutions and organizations from having their own hospitals and polyclinics, but that they themselves should maintain them.

Now let us consider what justification there was for demands to hasten the activity of the commission and introduce specific recommendations to deprive people of privileges that they enjoy unlawfully. Right from the start it seemed to us that everything obvious and that all that was necessary was a little digging and.... But what if we approached all problems superficially and "ran along" more quickly so as to be able to report more quickly? Under the conditions of permanent shortages and the complex economic situation we would merely drive the disease deeper. Having formed a "vacuum" by eliminating the privileges of one group, that vacuum would quickly be filled by another—perhaps representatives of the "shadow" economy. Are we really interested in this?

[Dolganov] But under our difficult conditions is it possible for any kind of privileges to exist, even those sanctioned by law? Many of our readers are asking this question. The call "to eliminate anything and everything" is rallying people at trade union and other meetings, and is heard in the resolutions of the meetings, and so forth. How justified is this, in your opinion?

[Pamfilova] I do not think that fairness can or should be understood in some primitive fashion, in an attempt to level everyone and everything, Sharikovskiy style—"Take everything and share it." This is unrealistic and it contradicts the aims of the economic reform that has been initiated in the country. Of course, overcoming leveling must be combined with greater social protection for all strata of the population, particularly low-income strata. Every person should enjoy some kind of social minimum. After that, a person should receive according to his ability and how he works. Wages should be the basic and only form of distribution. Wages should be higher for more skilled and responsible work without any of the "additional payments in kind" that now exist.

[Dolganov] Correct. However, there are people who enjoy these "additions" right along with their high wages, which insure well-being not only to themselves and their households, but also to their relatives and friends....

[Pamfilova] Let us not confuse different concepts. Of course, some privileges, including those for leading personnel, can and should be legitimate. This is in the interests of all of society. However, the commission is receiving many letters about abuse of official positions. The unlawful and impermissible maintenance of hunting lodges and land, special shops and other special distributions. If, for example, the leader of some department keeps a room reserved for himself throughout the year at a departmental sanatorium and makes use of it only 12 days a year, this is impermissible.

There is no need to cite other examples; the essential nature of what we are talking about is, I think, clear. The situation must be fundamentally changed. In our society it is really advantageous to get a sinecure, depending on rank, rather than to be a highly skilled, professional specialist. It seems to me that the main task of the economic reform is to create for every person the kind of conditions in which it would be advantageous to work efficiently and with high quality.

[Dolganov] But we are nevertheless living in a transitional period when the old is departing and the new is

still taking only its first timid steps and the general situation is not improving. So what must be done now?

[Pamfilova] I would like to say more about exactly this. Taking into account people's dissatisfaction with the fact that there are no clear-cut legal standards that define what is possible and what is not, we have proposed that the USSR Council of Ministers define precisely the status of leaders of all ranks. It is a question primarily of determining unambiguously and clearly the right of a leader (giving due consideration to his functions and status) to insure the proper, normal conditions for his labor and the maximum fruitful activity. In other words, what is established for him according to his rank, and not in terms of privileges but rather his legitimate conditions of work.

For example, personal transport. It is unlikely that anyone will demand, for example, that a minister travel about on his official business by streetcar. But how can this conclusion line up with a car being used to take his wife to the market, his son to the institute, a grandchild to school? We will return again to the subject of transport. I have used it here as an illustration to make the fundamental approach to the problem more understandable.

There is a fine legal nuance in this issue. We have proposed that the Council of Ministers define the status of a leader in absolute terms. But what about public organizations? They are independent, but I suggest that the same recommendation could apply to them also. You know, I am convinced that they will listen to us.

There is another important factor. The commission has concluded that the status of leader should apply to a very narrow range of people. For the rest, access to material blessings should be equal for all, depending on wages, which cannot be equal for all.

Will the people understand us when it has of late become fashionable to speak sometimes by speculating on what are perhaps not the brightest aspects of the human consciousness? I believe that they will. I have here a letter from a worker. Let me read it: "I know what I can do and how much I can earn. I am, therefore, not envious of nor do I object to the fact that an academician will receive more: Let him just make a real contribution to science. But I would like for us all to go the same store, through the same entrance, and that each person acquire for himself what he needs and what his wages will afford, that is, according to how much money he has in his pocket." This is surely how it should be with us.

[Dolganov] We have now arrived at a subject that for decades has been a painful one for our society—the wages paid for intellectual work. In my opinion, the controversies on this subject has become even sharper. Was this discussed at the meetings of the commission? And if so, what conclusions were reached?

[Pamfilova] In this case I can rely mainly on my own viewpoint, since the commission has not yet reached any conclusion or offered recommendations on this specific subject although we have held preliminary discussions. Our backwardness, and this is no secret, is largely connected with the constant underestimation of intellectual work. The dangerous trend of the "brain drain" out of the country was noted long ago, and unfortunately it is still happening to this day. Meanwhile, virtually everywhere in the world, from the United States to the young African states, they are trying to provide for themselves an intellectual elite (there is no need to impart to this word any kind of shade of suspicion) and a high level of reward for labor. This applies to the scientific and technical intelligentsia. Also managers, and I want particularly to emphasize this.

[Dolganov] We promised to deal with the question of personal transport....

[Pamfilova] About a million drivers are now employed in personal transport. Even given the very modest wages of this "army," overall maintenance of the "personal transport people" cost the state about R2.5 billion annually. How justified is this spending? For in fact, a person who has access to his own personal car receives from the state a monthly personal bonus of something on the order of R800. Is this bonus proper and necessary?

Or let us consider how those million cars are being used. Well who can calculate how much time they stand idle at entrance doorways, sometimes making no more than two trips a day? Here are some figures from the state automobile inspection service just for Leningrad Oblast. During the first six months of this year they recorded 79 cases in the city and 426 cases in the oblast when an official car was used for personal gain. If similar checks were conducted everyday the figures would probably be several orders of magnitude higher. And what about the figures for the entire country?

I will be talking about all this at the meeting on 10 December. With appropriate recommendations. I am sure I am not getting ahead of myself if I say that this will lead to a sharp reduction in the number of "personal transport people," and of course, we will be reporting on this.

There is one more matter that we hope to discuss, namely, personal pensions.

[Dolganov] Could you briefly describe your recommendations on this subject?

[Pamfilova] The proposal from the working group of which I am part, is to abolish personal pensions in general and introduce appropriate changes into the draft law on pensions. Of course, within the country there should be a system to distinguish people who have performed special services for the state. But what kind of system? For the greatest objections are not about the sizes of personal pensions (they are comparable to the sums proposed in the new law), but about the privileges attached to them.

But this is an opinion; the commission has only just started to discuss the matter. Moreover, the draft law has been submitted for national debate and after that the Supreme Soviet will again consider it. So we will not rush the matter.

[Dolganov] I hope that we will return to the subject of our conversation when new decisions have been reached.

New Deputy Premier Laverov Describes First Steps

PM0401100990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Pavlovich Laverov, by G. Alimov under the rubric "New Post: First Steps": "Different Approaches Necessary"—date, place of interview not given]

[Text] Prior to his appointment to the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology, Nikolay Pavlovich Laverov, 59 years of age, academician, mining engineer and geologist by profession, was president of the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences, and vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Alimov] You are just taking your first steps in your new post. What has turned out to be the most complex task?

[Laverov] I think that like all leaders, I found singling out the main avenue of work the most complex and crucial task. I had to pick out the key, top-priority problems, which demand immediate solutions, from among the large number of problems in the development of science and technology that have accumulated in the country and which have now become exposed, and to coordinate an appraisal with the scientific community at large and the corps of deputies. It is necessary to find the time to fit the solution of some of them into the 1990 plan.

[Alimov] What do you see as the priorities today in the work of the State Committee for Science and Technology?

[Laverov] I am a staunch supporter of a conceptual approach. Therefore my first steps were connected with the elaboration of a draft conceptualization of the improvement of the management of scientific and technical progress in the country in conditions of radical economic reform. The draft is now being discussed by the scientific and technical community. It formulates the main principles and singles out the basic elements of the new system of managing scientific and technical progress, based on the state and public regulation of innovatory processes instead of an excessively centralized system of state planning for the development of science and technology in the country.

[Alimov] Does your experience from your previous work help you? If so, how?

[Laverov] In some ways it helps, but in others it is a hindrance. I have had occasion to participate in resolving totally new, complex scientific and technical problems, which at first seemed insoluble. Therefore, I acquired a certain experience which strengthened my faith in the possibility that Soviet scientists can resolve difficult problems. But my experience is a hindrance because the well known former approaches and methods do not fit the new conditions and are unsuitable in this very responsible post. New ones are needed.

[Alimov] Has the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers any complaints to make to the chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology?

[Laverov] Many. The main one is that the new economic and legal basis for speeding up scientific and technical progress in the country is being set up and implemented too slowly. The scientific and technical complex is part of our society, and the perestroyka processes in its work are organically linked with the perestroyka of our whole life. However, the new economic mechanism that was launched in 1988, despite its positive elements, is not yet providing the necessary guarantee of a rise in the quality of scientific research and experimental and design work nor of the accelerated assimilation of the progressive production technologies that have been devised. Moreover, in 1989 wages rose at an unjustifiably rapid pace and there was a decline in the proportion of basic research. This mechanism needs to be adjusted.

In order to work on a par with world standards, we must ensure an accelerated development of basic and applied scientific research and concentrate resources on retooling production and the realization of priority state scientific and technical programs. We have to create an effective system for the expert examination of projects, carry out a renewal of science's cadre and the experimental potential, overcome monopolism, substantially expand contacts, enter the international scientific and technical community, and put an end to isolationism in science.

[Alimov] The new year always brings new hopes. What are your hopes?

[Laverov] I would very much like our people to be able to feel changes for the better in the economy in 1990.

Lyubimov Discusses Return to Taganka Theater

90UN0542A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 21 Dec 89 pp 1, 2

[Report on interview with Yuriy Lyubimov, artistic director of the Moscow Taganka Theater, by Marina Dolganova: "I Know Everything Here"]

[Text] **What happened in the Moscow Taganka Theater truly had to happen. During a general meeting of the collective, Yuriy Lyubimov was unanimously elected**

artistic director. Nikolay Gubenko, now USSR Minister of Culture, officially handed over to him the reins of management.

[Dolganova] Yuriy Petrovich, you have at last returned to your theater after long years of necessary absence. How did you find it? Has the spirit of Taganka survived?

[Lyubimov] Theater, as it is said in "Hamlet," is a mirror held up to nature (Hamlet's deathless words exhorting actors to be creative, not puppets). Thus, the theater, in the end, lost much during these sad years. Above all, actors lost the feeling that it is a house, their home; and the house was neglected. Excuse me, but the master of the house was required to leave it, more precisely, was exiled.

I returned, I had created this theater, I know everything here, down to the last board, the last light. Mainly I know people. I know who I can trust and who will support me. I know who is indifferent to my return and who is even pleased by the free atmosphere which now has formed. It is very important, because I can control the situation. But the matter, in the end, is not under my control. I must create for the actors a favorable environment for creativity. That is very difficult. Old equipment, laxity, these are external things, which can be straightened out quickly. There is a spiritual side to the question. That atmosphere, which must be created anew, is gone. The atmosphere, which creatively influences people, ennobles them.

I do not think that those who say that Taganka's times are past are correct. Here I understood even more, what significance Taganka had.

[Dolganova] How, in your view, is the process of the theater's rebirth going?

[Lyubimov] You know how it is when you return and the house has been completely neglected. I have been working for a month, day and night, trying to bring some kind or order. I have travelled with the theater to a number of countries, rehearsed there and revived old plays. And I presented new ones—"Feast in Times of the Plague;" "Daughter, Father and the Guitar Player" with Yura Medvedev; and revived "Crime and Punishment." I started work on a play about my late friend—here is his portrait—Nikolay Robertovich Erdman, friend of Bulgakov, and of many others. He is a writer who, unfortunately, is not widely known, as is much in our culture, and which we pass by not having noticed or having destroyed, like many people of genius, what poetry he has written, what fairy tales, what magnificent scenarios, which were spoiled by middle-grade directors and cut up by censorship. Soon his collected works will appear—I am in a commission on his legacy—and now I shall do this show which will contain his biography, texts, letters, and at the center—his brilliant play.

[Dolganova] These are your plans for the near future?

[Lyubimov] Then I must carry out my old contracts. The most important among them are in Hamburg "Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk Uyezd;" in Munich "Love for Three Oranges"—this is all our genius, including Prokofyev and Shostakovich; then "Small Tragedies," with the music of Alfred Shnitke; and, at last, "Queen of Spades" in Karlsruhe. The same project which was so "kindly supported" by the newspaper PRAVDA.

[Dolganova] Yes, the campaign, one remembers, was heavy-handed in 1978.

[Lyubimov] It was simply an outrage! "Hands off our Tchaikovskiy;" Shnitke, Rozhdestvenskiy, and I, and noble guardians with Zhiuraitis at the head were hoodlums. Incidentally, this publication caused concern in the socialist camp: What is it—a return to the Zhdanov cult? Such reprisals, such tactlessness. Later the prepared anger of the people followed. Why must we say these things now, because even now on occasion all try to invoke the people and their anger. Yet the people have to be told sometimes that there is something they did not understand. We have an old riddle: Art must be understood by the people, but not understandable to the people. These are two completely different things. Similar confusion in the people's minds is an exceptionally dangerous thing.

[Dolganova] Yuriy Petrovich, you presented much abroad. Are you preparing to bring something over to the Taganka stage? Do you have a favorite show that you presented in the West?

[Lyubimov] I worked in England, America, Scandinavia, Israel, France, Italy, and Germany. I presented more than 10 shows, very many operas. No, here I shall present none of them. Well, I liked "Feast in Times of the Plague" in Stockholm. For some reason I was attracted to Babel's "Zakat" and "Gabima." I liked opera: Berg's "Lulu," "Fidelio," "Don Giovanni" in Hungary, "Boris" and "Khovanshchina" at La Scala....

[Dolganova] Is Opera your special love?

[Lyubimov] I left here with nothing, fortunately my family was with me. And that was only because my wife is Hungarian and my boy Peter was born in Budapest. Therefore, by their laws, they could always come to me. They used to erect all kinds of barriers for me whenever I would leave for Hungary. Also it was difficult for Vladimir to travel to Paris in order to meet Vladya.

Thus, when I found myself in a difficult situation I received a number of offers to present operas in the most important theaters of the world. I never received an offer from my compatriots. Only once was I invited by the Tbilisi opera theater. That was long ago. Incidentally, this was like when the Georgians took in Pasternak, when Boris Leonidovich was being poisoned here. Do you remember his friend, the wonderful artist Gudyashvili? I had the honor of being acquainted with both of them. Certainly, all of the latest events, everything going on in Georgia and Armenia, has saddened me greatly.

These events demand examination, analysis, and finding the names of those at fault. I do not demand reprisals of any sort, but a wise, calm decision pertaining to both questions is essential, and they are not yet solved.

[Dolganova] Yuriy Petrovich, you are the only artistic director in the world whose principles are supported by the minister of culture.

[Lyubimov] Well, what?

[Dolganova] In my opinion, this is unprecedented.

[Lyubimov] You see, everyone cursed me and considered that I educated the collective badly. They picked on my work and even relieved me of my duties for this reason. But the minister grew up in the troupe. Such are the paradoxes.

[Dolganova] What do you think, will not the minister lose something as actor?

[Lyubimov] But he will continue playing. On the 18th [December] there was a charity show in the memory of Volodya, and on the 25th he will play Boris Godunov. In my opinion this is wonderful. I do my best to convince him to continue acting. This will only bring forth respect, in my opinion. But I also understand what fell on his shoulders, what a heavy cross he chose to bear.

[Dolganova] If you permit, a question not on the business at hand. Recently, in a joint advertising supplement issued by IZVESTIYA and IL MESSAGGERO, a photograph was published of you with a 1984 SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in your hands....

[Lyubimov] It happened coincidentally, and of course this is with irony. I was photographed and they gave me a newspaper, which, in those days, endlessly poured dirt on me. I said: "You want to photograph me with SOVETSKAYA KULTURA? Go ahead. But you knowa different newspaper?" You see I can ask difficult questions, too. You of me, I of you.

We talked with Yuriy Petrovich Lyubimov on the eve of the meeting of the troupe. An announcement giving its time hung in the background. Some kind of special warmth radiated from the words: "I earnestly request you to come. Respectfully yours, Yu. Lyubimov."

Remember, in "Master and Margaret": "...Here is your house, here is your eternal house. I know, that during the evening those you love, in whom you are interested and who will not disquiet you will come to you...."

Gidaspov Comments on Leningrad Events

90UN0512A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[Article by V. Abramov, A. Gamov, S. Karkhanin, and Yu. Nikolayev: "Neither Here Nor There"]

[Text] The meeting of the congress on the morning of 13 December began with an incident: After B.V. Gidaspov gave his report to the mandate commission, one of the deputies cast out a rejoinder from the hall:

"Are the functions of the chairman of the congress mandate commission compatible with those of the organizer of a rally of Leningrad communists?"

During the intermission we met with B.V. Gidaspov and asked him to comment on this rejoinder. Here is what he said:

"Maybe I am being a little too harsh but here is how I would describe this: It is neither here nor there. The functions of the chairman of the mandate commission are quite different from those of the secretary of the Leningrad Obkom [oblast committee]. The very high honor of being the organizer of the rally or at least the inspiration for it has been attributed to me. But in fact this is not right. The initiators of the rally were the rank and file, as they are called, the Leningrad communists, the party committees of a number of our largest industrial, mainly defense, enterprises, and it would be wrong and quite inadmissible for the Leningrad party gorkom [city committee] or obkom or the party rayon committee to stand on the sidelines of such a significant event and not try to direct this movement into some particular channel.

It seems to me that some people deliberately and some out of ignorance are trying to give a strange interpretation to the events taking place in Leningrad. This is being done, roughly speaking, according to this plan: To separate Gorbachev from the Central Committee and Gidaspov from the Leningrad party organization. The goal is to create a collision between the Central Committee and the party organizations and set their positions against one another. In the past I was a scientific associate and as chairman of a scientific soviet I usually categorically rejected such devices. This is how it works: You ascribe to your opponent some viewpoint which you have developed yourself and then you very successfully criticize it.

Many political forces have appeared in Leningrad today and the party organization has also made itself known. It is good that the party workers are no longer staying in their quiet offices, but are coming out into the streets. I think this is a very large positive contribution to the cause of perestroyka. There has never been any mention of an opposition between any policies. To be convinced of this all you have to do is look at the newspaper LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA where the platform of the Leningrad communists is published.

Our program contains three main points. The first is more rapid democratization of the party and the transfer of a number of the functions of the central party committees to local party organizations in order to allow each communist to participate in the development of strategic decisions. The second is further democratization of our society, that is, the enlistment of the largest possible number of workers and all segments of the society in the development of strategic decisions which

affect Leningrad and, perhaps, even the country as a whole. The third group of problems we are considering involves a radical acceleration of the economic reform.

Of course during rallies emotions sometimes go too far and I do not agree with many of the statements that were expressed. The same thing can be said about certain slogans that are appearing there. But I think we have enough internal conviction and enough internal strength to simply ignore such things. If somebody wants very much to find a flaw in our position and in the system of our actions and to drive us back into our offices, I do not think they should waste their time.

Moscow Party Leader Visits Production Association

LD0401160490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Comrade Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom (city party committee) of the CPSU, today visited the Moscow Elektrozavod production association named after Kyubyshev. His candidature has been put forward by this enterprise for election as deputy to the Moscow soviet. Comrade Prokofyev conversed with working people of the association. Communists there said that in the present complex situation, the CPSU, the initiator of perestroyka, should be supported and the authority of the party as the political vanguard of society restored.

Moscow Communists Hold Public Meeting

90UN0537A Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 1

[Article by Zh. Avyazova: "To Hear Each Other"]

[Text] There were many people in the square by the "Varshava" theater. Members of the Teenagers' Club known in the Leningradskiy Rayon as "Gnomes" spread the news everywhere: The communists are calling for a meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the draft of the pre-election platform of the rayon party organization.

"It's happened!" I thought when I learned about it. "Finally the party people have started doing something, they have decided to come out into the streets openly."

They have come out to make sure that they are going in the right direction, to compare a number of opinions that sometimes directly oppose one another. Such variety is typical now for an organ as complex as the CPSU.

"So, why have we gathered? What do we want?" asked the secretary of the shop party organization of the "Almaz" Central Design Bureau V.Kolonov as he was standing on the improvised dais. "First, so that the voice of rank-and-file communists—of the 'primaries' [primary party organizations] could finally be heard."

I want to jump ahead and say that their voice was heard. Whether the speeches were supported or objected to, nobody was prevented from having his say at the meeting.

One of the leaders of an informal organization who we talked to briefly said: "I was amazed how simple and easy it was for anyone to take the floor here. I remember that quite recently I moved toward the stage at a party meeting and wanted to say a few words but I was told something like: 'The Bolsheviks can do without you....'"

That was true: At the last meeting there was room for all kinds of slogans: "The perestroyka is doomed without democracy in the CPSU, for it will be crushed by the bureaucracy!", "Direct elections for the Congress!", "Freedom of speech and thought, of ideas and beliefs, of the radio and press, of platforms, fractions and parties!", "No privileges for communists of any rank!", "Voice of the 'primaries'—into the decisions of the Central Committee!" And there even was that one: "Partocracy! Hands off the interregional deputies' group!" though nobody understood what its author meant by his speech.

However, you could not understand the mood of the majority of the people just by reading all the slogans. One had to hear the reaction of the audience. It was seething with emotions. The moderator voiced a harmless request to the speakers to introduce themselves in a proper way and at once somebody countered it with: "Enough of 'proper ways'! Enough toadying!"

They were not judging the speakers by appearances, as the saying goes. For instance, two representatives of the Moskovskiy party club spoke one after another. But the balanced, though radical, position of V.Lysenko was met with respect while they booed I.Vasilyev who spoke in an unrestrained manner, intolerant of other opinions and "cried bucketfuls of Russian tears."

One of the speakers called on the public to support the appeal of six people's deputies of the USSR to the workers to hold a warning 2-hour strike before the Congress of the Soviets—the appeal publicized in leaflets that are surfacing everywhere. In response the crowd shouted from all sides: "Provocation of the first order!" But then they enthusiastically supported the viewpoint of the representative of the A.I.Mikoyan machine-building factory. He suggested that the right to elect delegates to the party congress should be offered directly to those large Moscow organizations in which the number of communists equals the representation norm.

They figured it all out, after all.

They also listened to the excited speech of G.Kogan, a machine-building factory worker, who reminded everybody that the Manifesto of the Communist Party is topped by the words: "Workers of the world, unite!" and appealed to the people for mutual tolerance.

So what should we do: Unite or separate? But maybe it is an interconnected process? It is just that very often we

cannot think and listen to each other seriously because of the heated emotions and mutual misunderstanding that are building up even within our "party home?" Does that mean we should do away with dissenters or start a tug-of-war between the two sides? But do we need to rush into a confrontation, do we need to aggravate the antagonism? Would it be wiser to combine the elements of all positions that are useful and constructive? Our main need at present is to consolidate our forces.

It seems that the participants of the meeting chose this very way, a balanced one, to arrive at the approval of their pre-election platform and at the definition of their further policy. As many communists pointed out, the division line does not separate workers from the intelligentsia or people of one nationality from another but it does separate the adherents of the system of administrating and ordering from the opponents of the system. The resolution contained the majority opinion on the need for direct and secret ballot, with more than one candidate nominated to be a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress. It also mentions that the right of the party to be the guiding and directing force in society should be earned by it rather than given to it through the constitution. The resolution also says that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] should be given political, economic and legal independence, that the soviets should have real power, that the social sphere gets top priority in development, that the industries harmful for the environment are removed from the region.

Well, the communists of the Leningradskiy Rayon of Moscow were quite outspoken when they displayed their convictions and their determination to fight for perestroyka.

An event took place that was very important in its very principle.

"What does today's meeting mean for me?" asked E. Chernyak, secretary of the party committee of a design bureau, expressing the opinion of the majority. "It means the beginning of the countdown for our forces before the 28th party congress. It will help us to define our positions and to join our forces."

Foundation Formed To Cultivate Talented Youth

LD2712223789 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 27 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The task of a new public organisation, the all-union foundation "Intellect of the 21st Century", is to look for talented young people and support them. Its constituent conference was held today at the Presidium of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The Soviet Young Communist League (YCL) became one of its founders.

"It has long become a tradition in this country to organise specialised schools, to hold all kinds of contests with a view to finding talented young people. However, those were just separate links which are to be made into an integrated all-union system of looking for talented youths and girls and creating favourable conditions for the development of their talent. This country needs talented people badly", Viktor Mironenko, co-chairman of the foundation, first secretary of the YCL Central Committee, told TASS.

The "Intellect of the 21st Century" foundation will use world experience in this sphere and will cooperate with other countries, Mironenko pointed out.

Inertia in, Exodus From Party Criticized

PM0301151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Yevgeniy Solomenko under the "Discussion Rostrum" rubric: "The Party and Perestroyka: Knight at the Crossroads"]

[Text] When you attend different meetings you can see for yourself almost every time that everyone nowadays has learned to structure their reports in a competent and skillful way and liberally sprinkles them with the most up-to-date terminology, making the text breathe with the militant spirit of perestroyka.

But do these graphic, upbeat reports always contain sincere pain, shame, and awareness of our common responsibility for the gas pipelines that have exploded, submarines that have sunk, people burned alive in trains, or those consumed by the equally fierce flames of interethnic enmity. Or for the shortages, the endless waiting lines, the food coupons, inflation, and the crime rate?

The main question is how to overcome all this and ensure that words about perestroyka do not remain mere mouthings. [passage omitted]

You quite often hear people say "The party has planned, but some Communists are opposed. But aren't these "some" also part of the party? Yes, and it is necessary to establish ultimately what we have customarily implied by the word "party." The broad masses of Communists or only the nomenklatura of senior party workers, the party apparatus....

When the USSR people's deputies elections were held in Tomsk, the authority of the oblast party committee [obkom] suffered a drastic decline.

"Yes, we wanted to overorganize and dictate everything as in the past," Ye. Vologdin, the then chief of the obkom organizational department, acknowledged subsequently.

In recent years the obkom, while working under constant great pressure and scoring undoubted successes in many areas, has also allowed a whole series of serious disruptions to occur. They stem from the oblast bosses' clinging to the old leadership style. Members of the obkom and some bureau members have begun to speak about this publicly from various rostrums.

And V. Zorkaltsev, first secretary of Tomsk Party Obkom, acknowledged repeatedly in a report he delivered to one plenum that the obkom's work style has become obsolete in many respects and needs to be scrapped.

This command-based, coercive style has generated ever-increasing resistance on the part of the inhabitants of Tomsk Oblast. It is no wonder that the public voters' clubs and other informal organizations have now markedly intensified their activity in the runup to the local soviet elections. People are thoroughly fed up with the apparatus' playing at electoral "democracy" and want honest and direct voting without any flaws. Activists have already split Tomsk up into zones and are systematically conducting agitation work there.

Who, then, are these "oppositionists?" Opponents of socialism, a fifth column, enemies who have emerged from the underground? Not at all. Most of them are members of our party, and again most of them—I would venture to claim—are far from being renegades or opportunists who have gotten in to the party through the back door.

The situation seems paradoxical: Communists versus Communists. But when you get to the heart of the matter, you realize that there is no paradox here at all.

So perhaps many communists who belong to informal organizations are genuine articulators of the people's cares and woes? Why then are they forced to act virtually clandestinely, at spontaneous rallies, outside their own party organizations? Probably because it is so difficult for the "lower echelons of the party" to get their truth heard at the top through official channels.

The obvious can no longer be concealed: Quite a few opportunists, careerists, freeloaders and sometimes people blatantly hostile to the ideas of communism have wormed their way into the party. But we continue to follow a primitive path, sometimes delivering a hasty, indiscriminate verdict: "Unorthodox thinker equals the enemy!" Hence I am sometimes seized by the fear that it will only take a little more indiscriminateness and we will, through stupidity, alienate once and for all the vital and active forces of the party that bring diversity of opinion.

Let us finally acknowledge—and not fear this acknowledgement—that the CPSU today is a party of contradictions. Contradictions between its "right" and "left" tendencies, between the ossification of a significant part of the apparatus and the activity of communist members of informal organizations which spills out into the streets, between the party being first to proclaim the course of perestroyka and its lagging behind in the implementation of that course. If the party is to be renewed and operate successfully we must understand what trends actually exist in it and what platform a given Communist, particularly a leader, supports.

I have already heard some orthodox champions of "purity of the ranks" giving way to hysteria. "Factionalism! Split!"—they intone. I answer this by citing authorative opinion. "The party struggle endows the party with strength and vitality, the greatest evidence of the party's weakness is its vagueness and blurring of sharply defined borders, the party is fortified by the fact that it cleanses itself." V.I. Lenin used these lines from a letter Lassalle sent to Marx as an epigraph to his essay *"What Is To Be Done?"*

We remember the long winter of dreadful tyranny for which in many respects the panicky fear of factionalism was responsible. There is now a polarization of forces under way both within society and the party. This is a healthy political process, and it should not be feared. We should be worried on a quite different score—by the fact that it is proceeding far more slowly inside the CPSU than within society as a whole.

It is no wonder that party membership cards with the declaration "I no longer wish to be a member of the CPSU" are increasingly found on party committee secretaries' desks. It is painful to speak about this, and the process is not clear cut. Various people are to be found among these "refuseniks."

"The voluntary exodus from the party ranks is intensifying," V. Mindolin, first secretary of Novosibirsk's Sovetskiy Rayon CPSU Committee, notes. "I specially meet with former party members in their laboratories and shops. I have seen for myself once again that they are not at all rats deserting a ship. Many of them are generally thought to be good, honest people. It is simply that they feel unable to fully realize their life stance in the conditions of life obtaining in the party."

Those who remain within the party ranks, do they realize their life stance? The secretary of the party bureau of one of the institutes of Novosibirsk's Akademgorodok acknowledged not without bitterness:

" I hold a meeting. Everything seems normal. But what I see in front of me in the hall are 100 people in a long, profound sleep."

I deliberately avoid naming the institute, for the picture is in many respects typical. It is simply that this party organiser is more frank than the others. Yet passions do seethe in the institute. Pamyat activists, "greens"—or environmentalists—supporters of the Democratic Movement...are operating there. But the Communists are as if in a state of suspended animation. Berating them and accusing them of passivity is the simplest and perhaps most mistaken thing to do. Let us recall that primary party organizations have been in the position of possesing no rights for decades. As a result, the principle of building the CPSU was distorted and ordinary Communists were essentially excluded from deciding fundamental questions. We are reaping the fruits of autocratic rule. Perestroyka has to date changed little on this plane. I think that it is time to give the grass-roots organizations real rights, perhaps even before the party congress, after

open discussion of the new draft CPSU Statutes to make substantial changes to it in favor of democratic principles. Only then will those deep in slumber be able to wake up. In my opinion, we have to address this right now.

Of course, such tendencies are to be seen not just in Novosibirsk and Tomsk, they are typical, in my view, of virtually all obkoms and kray party committees [kraykom].

The itchy feet, uncertainty, and passivity of some party staffs are leading to ever-growing anarchy at local level. And the blame for this is mostly pinned on the Central Committee and its Politburo. You constantly hear "The center does not provide us with ideas!" "There are no concrete instructions."

Old habits conducive of routine and lack of initiative are incredibly resilient. We have somehow gotten used to the Central Committee plenums solving everything for us—just execute the instructions and send the approved resolutions down. Confusion and lack of ability are what the x-ray highlights of the level of political thinking of a considerable proportion of party cadres.

"You know, I envy the enterprise directors elected by their own collectives," acknowledged M. Zhuravlev, chief of the Tomsk CPSU Obkom Ideology Department. "They have received a vote of confidence from their own workers and engineers. It is time for everyone one of us party apparatus workers to submit to the fires of competitive selection—if you survive, you will feel that you are the legitimate representative of not just the oblast conference delegates but all the oblast's Communists.

Such a procedure would invest party workers with the invaluable gift of psychological independence from the leadership and offer conscious discipline instead of the need to stand to attention and sycophantically hang on the party bigwigs' every word.

Of course, the first steps toward the democratization of the party apparatus, toward the elective principle are already being taken. Thus a pretty unusual announcement has appeared in the Tomsk Oblast newspaper, KRASNOYE ZNAMYA: The party obkom ideology commission has announced a competition to fill the vacant post of deputy chief of the obkom ideology department.

Attempts are now being made, without waiting for blessing from above, to open wide the party portals and involve the public more actively in the search for further routes. For example, the Novosibirsk city party committee [gorkom] held its plenum on questions of democratization in the life of the city party organization. Its participants were presented with the Novosibirsk Communists' draft platform for the local soviet elections, which had already undergone preliminary discussion in shops, laboratories, higher education departments, and on construction sites. Thousands of city dwellers took part in the democratic debates. After the working people of Novosibirsk had formulated their view on the prospects, the session of the "longest" plenum was resumed. The will of rank-and-file Communists and nonparty people was affirmed at it.

Yet local initiative is unable to develop properly until the fetters of outmoded restrictions are removed. That is why the resolutions of party meetings, decisions of party plenums at various levels, and articles and speeches are demanding increasingly loudly that primary organizations be given the final say on who is admitted to the party and be accorded autonomy. The times insistently demand that party life be enriched by the direct secret election on a multicandidate basis of all secretaries—from primary party organizations up to the CPSU Central Committee—as well as delegates to conferences and congresses. Only then can the rivulets of decisions taken by the primary organizations, party committees, and raykoms form a torrent of vital water capable of rejuvenating and giving fresh vigor to our entire party. Real captains will prove their worth amidst this powerful torrent. Consequently party staffs must be formed anew—from below, not above. This approach will lift existing proscriptions and give politically active Communists the right to operate and take decisions, displacing the inert reactionary stratum from party committees.

Alas, these are dreams as yet. The bonds of the outmoded Statutes still fetter us. It sometimes seems that the Communist today is like a knight at the crossroads. The way ahead is obstructed by a boulder. He has to choose his path: One way means giving up and leaving the party, the other joining the motley ranks of the members of informal groups or falling into lethargic slumber and lapsing into political and moral infantilism. No, people are increasingly coming to the realization that the best thing is to drag aside the moss-covered administrative boulder together, to remove the fetters from one's legs, and to finally go forward with a confident tread.

New Obkom First Secretary in Arkhangelsk

90UN0534A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 51, 20 Dec 89 p 3

[Interview with Yu.A. Guskov, first secretary of the Arkhangelsk Oblast, conducted by A. Nikitin: "Portrait in the Oblast Interior"]

[Text] Changes occurred recently in the Arkhangelsk Obkom [Oblast Party Committee]. First Secretary P.M. Telepnev retired on pension. As a result of elections on a choice basis this position came to be occupied by Yu.A. Guskov.

Yuriy Aleksandrovich was born in 1936. He was born in Leningrad Oblast, but has spent almost all his working life in Arkhangelsk Oblast and he married an indigenous coast-dweller here. He began work as an assistant foreman at a plant in Severodvinsk and subsequently became involved in party work.

What does your policy have in common with Telepnev's and how will it differ? A. Nikitin, correspondent for the Non-Chernozem Area, put to him as his first question.

[Guskov] I liked the energy with which Petr Maksimovich, who had previously worked in Tyumen, advanced new directions in the oblast economy, which is quite one-sided, a timber economy. Sizable reserves of oil, gas, and diamonds have been discovered here. We will continue this policy. The main thing, however, in my opinion, is improving the life of the ordinary northerner and making him the genuine master in his region. A strengthening of the spirit of party comradeship and the role of the soviets, democratization, regional financial autonomy, leasing.... Long-term leasing will, specifically, allow us to operate in the forests like our Scandinavian neighbors. Restoring the forests, working in single areas and extracting the maximum end product, and not leaving behind a wilderness.

[Nikitin] When will there be cod in Arkhangelsk, without which people used not to dine here? I have asked this of the third oblast leader in succession now.

[Guskov] Supplies of codfish in the Barents Sea and the ocean have declined sharply, and a number of countries have imposed quotas and introduced licenses. Currently our powerful fleet is catching three times less cod than a few years ago. This is the objective aspect. But, in addition, the USSR State Planning Committee and Ministry of Trade recognize only two rules of arithmetic: Subtraction and division. Up to 90 percent of the catch is appropriated from us. This is, I believe, an outrage. We will strive to ensure that at least half remain in the oblast. And this is not overdoing things. It is fish and potatoes for us, there is nothing else—we live near the Arctic Circle.

[Nikitin] But back in the 1920's your area was called the country's "currency shop." Hundreds of foreign ships come to Arkhangelsk every year for boards, cellulose and other timber commodities. What does the city and the area get out of this!

[Guskov] As in the fable: "passed the moustache, but did not reach the mouth". Given this golden stream, we could have been a second Rotterdam or Hong Kong, but here.... The "devotees of two rules of arithmetic" from the central departments did their work here also.

Some things are now changing. Seventeen percent of proceeds is left with the enterprises. The bulk goes to purchase modern equipment, on the environment and on the development of a consumer goods industry. One-fourth, on the purchase of imported commodities for the work force, medicines and disposable syringes. I believe that the proportion of foreign currency proper should constitute no less than 50-60 percent of proceeds. We would be removing the strained situation concerning food and industrial commodities.

[Nikitin] How did the story concerning the "house on the shore," which was shown on television, end?

[Guskov] In a session of the oblast soviet, which uncovered 13 flagrant violations, and a resolve not to allow henceforward either "prestige" homes or "telephone law" in the allocation of accommodation.

[Nikitin] How is Sivnov—the "Arkhangelsk muzhik"?

[Guskov] You know, we are asked this not only in the country, but abroad also. I called Nikolay Semenovich recently. He is alive and well and raising 10 head of livestock and is full of new plans. One of my first oblast trips will be to "Red Hill", to see him.

Gorbachev Plenum Speech Published as Brochure

LD0201212890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] The brochure, "Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: Perestroyka's fate is in the unity of the party, a REPORT to the CPSU Central Committee Plenum delivered on 25 December 1989" has been published. The brochure is published by POLITIZDAT and is printed by the Krasnyy Proletariy printing press.

Readers' Letters on Socialism Reviewed

PM0401134590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 90 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Genrikh Volkov: "Overcast Morning? Thoughts on Readers' Letters on New Look of Socialism"]

[Text] Almost the brightest sign of the times is the politicization of the thinking of all strata of the population. We have all become politicians. The events taking place in the country, the laws which are being debated, the personal qualities of politicians are being fiercely debated at mass meetings, in the smoking rooms and corridors of plants and institutions, and in lines.

The nature of readers' mail has also changed. At the PRAVDA editorial office I was convinced that it is not only complaints about daily life and housing but also letters of political and theoretical content which have now come flooding in.

Back in July last year PRAVDA published a collective article entitled "For a Modern Concept of Socialism," which generated a big response.

M.S. Gorbachev's article "The Socialist Idea and Revolutionary Perestroyka" published 26 November 1989 gave rise to a new pretext and incentive for readers' thoughts. The article keenly raised the question of the topicality of Marxist-Leninist teaching for the destiny of perestroyka. Readers are also considering this. What key problems are raised in their letters?

Marxism is a revolutionary-critical theory. That it is revolutionary goes without saying. But I would also stress that it is **critical.** Critical not only with regard to external reality but also with regard to itself. That means renouncing complacency and self-satisfaction with the

"ultimate truth" that has been attained. Marxism, as we know, did not arise in the form of a sectarian teaching fenced off by a dense wall from the winds of world history, but on the broad highway of the development of human civilization, science, and culture, absorbing all the best achievements of human genius. And this teaching ceases to be Marxism if it ceases to be an open teaching—open to all vigorous currents of new life and new thought.

The majority of the generation of sociologists now teaching in the higher educational establishments has assimilated Stalinized Marxism-Leninism, emasculated and deadened, consisting of ironclad structures and formulas.

This "teaching," of course, cannot enter "the flesh and blood," cannot arouse the thoughts and the soul. Hence the "disillusionment" with Marxism. Hence the mass obsession with all kinds of "isms" which began back in the sixties: For instance, structuralism and the systems approach as the last word in "scientific philosophy" were set against Marxism. But unfortunately it was precisely the systems approach in the unity of the functional and historical-genetic planes was brilliantly implemented by Marx in *Das Kapital* over a century ago!

The theoretical model of the capitalist system was reproduced with the aid of the method of proceeding from the abstract to the concrete. Lenin once noted that no Marxist understood Marx 50 years ago. He had in mind the logic and philosophy of "Das Kapital." Alas, this rebuke could be directed against many sociologists, especially economists, even today.

Of course, the capitalism which Marx subjected to critical analysis has already vanished into oblivion. But the methodological principles by which Marx was guided in "Das Kapital" remain imperishable. Yet it is these which are the least studied. In declaring Marxism to be obsolete are we not throwing the baby out with the bath water, to use the well known expression?

"In denying Stalinism," F. Gorelik from Voroshilovgrad writes to PRAVDA, "and the barracks-administrative system, even some doctors of philosophical sciences and eminent economists and writers sometimes hint that the roots must be sought in the unsoundness of Marxism and Leninism, which allegedly generated Stalinism. What then can be said of the ordinary engineer, doctor, or teacher, if professors are in doubt?"

Now there is a new epidemic: the universal obsession with Russian Christian philosophy. There is no denying that for many decades we were robbing ourselves and our own spiritual cultural assets. Books on the history of philosophy set forth in the tiniest detail the thoughts of the greatest German philosophers. Yet the leading lights of unique Russian thought imbued with the highest spirituality have become a revelation to us only now. People with a total disregard for their origins!

But in line with the famous feature of the Russian character, once someone has set about praying he is prepared to dash his brains out doing it. From one extreme to the other. Some people cannot wait to put Christian philosophy in the place of the tablets of Marxism, which they say has nothing to do with man. All production forces and production relations, the basis and the superstructure.

Indeed, it has set our teeth on edge to the point where they ache. But it is not in any way Marx, Engels, and Lenin who are to blame but our own banal Marxist studies which are to blame. In a polemic with Mikhaylovskiy, Lenin once heatedly objected there are few scientific treatises in which you can find as much "heart" as in "Das Kapital."

We have understood the letter but not the living soul of Marxism, not its bold, merry prose, as Engels put it. What do we know of the lofty spirituality of Marxism-Leninism? And should we set it against the lofty spirituality of Christian philosophy?

The general human values of whose priority we are now speaking were, incidentally, brought forth not by religion alone but by the entire development of culture.

Man with his ideas, notions, passions, interests, abilities, and requirements occupies the central place in the system of Marxism. Production forces, production relations, and so on and so forth are merely expressions of various aspects of his activity. Man is the end of the movement of all society.

Some people are inclined to link "state and bureaucratic" and "military-feudal" socialism with the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. But where and when did Marx, Engels, and Lenin portray future society like this? Was it not Marx who, back in 1844, branded crude, barracks communism as a form of the manifestation of the vileness of private ownership anxious to assert itself as formal socialization, as envy and the desire to level down, as "the denial of the entire world of culture and civilization," as "a return to the **unnatural** simplicity of the **poor** and crude man with no needs." For this communism, Marx believed, commonality "is merely the commonality of **labor** and the equality of the **wages**" paid by the community (state?) as "the universal capitalist." This way of eliminating private ownership "is not its true assimilation."

All these thoughts can be found described in the most recent articles about the troubles of our society as the most modern. There is a lot written in these articles about man's alienation from the means of production, about how the slogan "land for the peasants" or "the factories for the workers" has remained no more than a declaration. Yet was Marx not the first to subject to an in-depth analysis this now fashionable concept of alienation and self-alienation? And to counter it with the self-determination of the individual in labor.

Marx is responsible for the murderous criticism of bureaucracy before which the sharpest and most malicious attacks on our bureaucratic system by today's journalists pale into insignificance.

So should the watchword of "the modern concept of socialism," whether its authors want it or not, be, in my opinion, backward? No—forward! To Marx and Lenin.

The authors of a number of letters call for an end to utopianism in arguments about the society in which we are living and which we are building. They are now recalling as an anecdote Khrushchev's statement that the present generation of Soviet people will live under communism.

The theory of developed socialism was also utopian. The opinions of some authors of the new concept are also utopian: It is essential first of all to clearly define the socialist ideal and only then give it practical embodiment in life.

Let us recall again the allegedly obsolete Marx who believed that communism is not an ideal to which reality should adapt but a real social movement. And it is here that Marxism differs fundamentally from preceding utopian theories.

Alas, for us now "the task of transforming socialism from a utopia into a science is no less topical than it was, for instance, 150 years ago for the founders of Marxism" (Ye. Andryushin, Orel City).

Idealized declarations divorced from the realities of life give rise to profound skepticism and political apathy. They merely discredit perestroyka. They include in particular promises that all difficulties can be resolved in 2-3 years.

They also include obsession with laws. The naive faith that you only have to adopt good laws for all eventualities of life for society to be transformed (as though by magic). The entire Decembrist movement suffered from this faith in a good constitution, in just laws. And even earlier the representatives of the French Enlightenment and the late 18th century revolutionaries also suffered from it. But let us recall that the guillotine worked without respect under the declaration of human and civil rights. That Stalin's constitution, which was indeed "the most democratic in the world," became "the most reliable" screen for repressions.

And now too laws are being adopted which immediately turn out to be imperfect and lead to results which are the direct opposite of what their authors counted on. Engels called this an irony of history. Of course, it is not a case of democratic laws not being necessary. But they should not be hasty or thoughtless. And if they are adopted it should be with a guarantee of their unconditional fulfillment.

Socialism must acquire the status of a science. What does that mean? We can speak of socialism only when it has been economically substantiated. And, let us add, politically substantiated.

"The totalitarian state which we have built has nothing in common with socialism" (V. Martynenko, Kharkov City).

The proposition is of course debatable. Yet we have had in our country "socialism which has been basically built," "the full and final victory of socialism," "the building of communism which has been launched," and "developed socialism" and we are now speaking of "deformed socialism." But you can only deform what was once without flaws.

Let's try to take a realistic look at things. The basic principle of socialist society is "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor." We set about implementing this principle in the first years of Soviet power. But did we implement it fully? From each according to his abilities means that each person's abilities must be revealed and developed to the utmost. This also means that these abilities must not remain unused.

The implementation of the principle to each according to his labor is even more complex. We have not yet learned to assess at its worth highly skilled labor showing quality, enterprise, innovation, or intellectual content. Also operating, by virtue of inertia, is the levelling down whereby a young engineer or scientific worker, teacher or doctor receives the same (or less) as an unskilled worker. Whereby a foreman or technician is prepared to change places with the workers. Whereby there is no incentive to produce to a higher quality or more cheaply but there is an incentive to produce in gross output terms, in terms of materials consumed, that is more expensively.

It has turned out that it was too early to renounce commodity-money relations, that as a self-regulator of the economic mechanism they are irreplaceable even under socialism. It has turned out that it is impossible to control the national economy effectively only with plans and resolutions issued from above.

In the search for a way out of the deadlock in the economy we turned to Lenin's legacy from the last years of his life and to the experience of the New Economic Policy of the twenties, to a reconsideration of the country's tragic and heroic history.

Journalists and historians have engaged in recent years in a strict reassessment of the values of socialist society. A painful question arose most acutely: Were the "great terror" and the other "deformations of socialism" in the thirties and forties inevitable? Or was it a case of the personal qualities of Stalin and his entourage? But in that case how did it happen that a demagogue and Marxist doctrinaire with criminal inclinations was promoted by the party as a leader and became the "father of all the peoples?" This question also perturbs the newspaper's readers. Recently in the search for original sin people have begun to put the blame on the October

revolution and the red terror of the first years of Soviet power. "Stalin," one reader writes, "merely continued what Lenin had begun."

This can only be asserted by taking absolutely no account of the specific historical truth. People forget the "detail" that what occurred in 1918-1921 as an enforced measure designed to protect the revolution from a mortal threat, a measure in response to the terror of the White Guards and the Socialist Revolutionaries, became in the thirties and forties criminal genocide against our own people, the betrayal of the revolution, the discrediting of socialism, and the slaughter of Lenin's party guard.

But nonetheless—how did this become possible? In his time Marx put a similar question, analyzing the reasons which brought to power a most insignificant man—Napoleon III—the minor nephew of a great uncle. He was able to make use of the reflected light of a great name—a symbol of national glory and greatness. Petit bourgeois and peasant France pinned its hopes on him. He was ecstatically supported by the lumpen elements of Paris who belonged to his guard. And nonetheless, Marx noted, a nation, like a woman, is not forgiven a minute's weakness when any adventurist can do violence to her. France had to pay for this with the shame of the defeat at Sedan and the capture of the emperor.

Just as our people had to pay—with the millions of victims of genocide and the shame of retreat in the first months of the war. Analyzing revolutionary movements, Marx noted an important natural law: history's retreat after a revolutionary breakthrough. The ninth wave of a revolution splashes far into the future, ahead of its time, destroying everything in its path. But then "force of circumstances" inevitably leads to the wave being rolled back, leaving silt, slime, and mud on the shore. That was what happened in France, that was also what happened in Russia. After the "triumphal march of the revolution" when it seemed that the victory of communism on a world scale was a stone's throw away, a sobering up began. The experience of revolution advanced to the front of the historical stage new social strata and party leaders of the new formation.

According to the thinking of the authors of a number of letters and articles to the editorial office, the whole point was that the leading position in society and in the party was taken by semiproletarian or "lumpen" strata, semiliterate elements from the countryside and the city with the slave mentality of former serfs and a faith going back many centuries in the tsar as father, and with their almost equal poverty and equal aggressiveness.

The intellectual debates of the old party men did not suit the newly elected members with their party cards. One can imagine how at the party congresses, conferences, and plenums after Lenin the auditorium listened coolly and suspiciously to the ornate "professorial" speeches of Zinovyev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and other "mumbling intellectuals." And how it gave a tumultuous greeting to the simple, rather coarse Stalin with his "plain truth," with his direct, staccato speech, with his rhetorical questions fired at the opposition. They were also impressed by Stalin's impatience—faster, faster, faster with industrialization and collectivization, through all the victims, over the corpses, but toward the imminent—it's nearly there—paradise on earth. The end justifies the means!

And indeed the rapid pace of economic development in both industry and agriculture were an objective need at the time.

But some people are prepared to call that Stalinism. The majority of readers, to judge by their letters, resolutely disagree with that. Of course, neither the destruction of the hardest working strata of the peasants nor the mass bloody repressions, nor the concentration camps with their millions of inmates, nor the deportation of entire nations were dictated by any necessity. Even in the party itself there were healthy forces ready to remove the uncontrolled "helmsman" from the helm of control.

That means that there was the possibility of a different historical course for our country. There was and will be!

That means, notes reader P. Nepomnyashchikh from Gorkiy, that "we cannot view our history in a one-sided, metaphysical way. We must clearly differentiate between what was generated in it by 'force of circumstances' and what was brought by Stalin's tyranny and lawlessness."

Nor is the forthcoming path of development homogenous. But nonetheless, what will it be like, our immediate future? Some authors believe it will be "overcast." "The overcast morning of perestroyka?" We can already see it. The bright hopes which were pinned on it have not yet been fulfilled. It has turned out not to be so simple to move the heavy rolling stock of our economy, stuck in the impasses of stagnation, from the rusty rails.

There is a long path ahead with many ordeals. It is obvious that "democratic," "humane" socialism will pass through a number of stages in its development. And what surprises await us on this path we still do not know. An overcast, windy, foggy morning, but still a morning which perhaps promises a sunny day?

The main thing has nonetheless been done. Man has changed. His spiritual world has changed. In these 4 years—a surprisingly brief period—we have put an end to the worst legacy of serfdom and slavery—the slavery of the spirit with its "we shall approve," "the leadership knows best," and "it's nothing to do with us."

And that is a guarantee that the heavy rolling stock of our economy and our society will nonetheless get moving. Readers think that history is indeed becoming worldwide before our eyes. Today it is increasingly clear that capitalism and socialism are two opposites of a single essence—man's progress. The destruction of one will inevitably delay the development of mankind because movement is the struggle (and unity!) of opposites.

"The priority of general human values will only become reality when millions and millions of people are able to rise above their class-based national philosophical, political, or any other narrow-mindedness, when they learn to regard the whole world as their common home" (P. Nepomnyashchikh).

Let's be realists. History, as was long ago stated very correctly, is not the Nevskiy Avenue sidewalk. It has its zigzags. And, as we ourselves became convinced in the 20th Century, it has its reverses.

But we shall also remain optimists. Man has no other path.

We shall wait and see, as they say. But we shall not be passive spectators on the stage of history, especially the immediate history of our own country. Much depends on that.

Siberian Writers Association Formed

90UN0365B Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 48, 29 Nov 89 p 2

[Report by Ya. Samokhin: "From Rumors to Fact"]

[Text] The founding conference of the Siberian Writers' Association (SPAS) has been held in Novosibirsk.

This has been discussed and written about for a fairly long time: Since the beginning of summer there have been rumors about the forthcoming separation of Siberian writers and the creation of their own organization. Finally the time has come when real facts have replaced the rumors.

At the conference they elected as chairman of the association V. Zelenskiy, who is now the head of the Siberian Writers' Organization. The association's charter and platform were also adopted.

The association's main task is the unite all creative forces of Siberia in order to solve the region's problems.

The leadership of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Writers' Association was cool toward this event. That is, they were disturbed, of course; but when it became clear that this would not take things to the point of a schism and that the SPAS would operate within the framework of the existing writers' structures, the leaders of the Russian Writers' Union calmed down. Delegates from Chita, Khakasiya, Karasnoyarsk, Barnaul, Kemerovo, Tomsk, Tyumen, Buryatiya, and other regions of Siberia spoke about the need to take advantage of the province's great intellectual reserve and decentralize the country's culture. Concrete paths were also discussed: How to most fully familiarize the reader with Siberian literature, journalism, and social thought—both that which is new and that which is hidden in the archives of Siberia....

The association's immediate plans are to gain its own right to be accepted into the Writers' Union, to produce its own periodical, and to develop cooperation among Siberian publishing houses.

Interior Ministry Publication in Petrozavodsk

LD2812122289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 28 Dec 89

[Text] On the eve of new year, a new newspaper has appeared on sale in Petrozavodsk. Its very name CH P: KOMMENATARII, SOBITIYA, FAKTY [emergency: commentaries, events, facts] shows the intentions of the publisher, the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] of Karelia, to hold an active dialogue with the readers.

This conclusion is borne out by the material in the first issue. Here, apart from a chronology of crime, a large section is devoted to replies of MVD specialists to questions from inhabitants of the autonomous republic, an analysis of the state of crime and the ways of reducing it. All the profits from that publication will go to charity.

Writer Criticizes MOLODAYA GVARDIYA

PM0301174190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Pavel Gutionov article: "Recent Issues of Periodicals. Shameful..."]

[Text] I read the latest (the 12th of 1989) issue of the periodical MOLODAYA GVARDIYA.

It is quite a typical issue.

On the one hand, the October Revolution is the result of a conspiracy against the Russian people while, on the other hand, we cannot allow anyone to even threaten its ideals. Which ideals, as is being constantly stressed, were implemented in a "weighty, crude, and visible" way between roughly 1929 and 1953. The advantages of this kind of socialism are propagandized in every way in the periodical and the words "the tyrant Stalin" are enclosed in ironical inverted commas.

And, of course, there are not just 434 but as many as 700 Jews with a higher education for every 1,000 people in our country, so D. Zhukov somehow established in the foreword to V. Shulgin's "Days"; and these stunning figures are then cited in three (!) items in the edition.

And of course, "with someone's connivance," inconceivable events are taking place in the country. Thus, "on the pages of certain publications, provocations are fabricated time after time, whose sting is sharpened so as to take reprisals against objectionable people and independent thinkers." In the opinion of the deputy chief editor, who expresses himself in the editorial, the provocateurs include OGONEK and IZVESTIYA, as well as NEDELYA, YUNOST, ZNAMYA, OKTYABR, and SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, which are "affiliated to

them." It was also stated how the "independent thinkers" can be protected from the sting that has been sharpened for the reprisals: "Wouldn't it be better to follow the example of Cuba, which closed its doors to MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI without any superfluous debate?

Well, in the name of pluralism and democracy, I think that there ought to be a newspaper where such ideas can be propagated unhindered. The "example of Cuba" probably needs a critical interpretation all the same, and I would not demand that "the doors be closed without any superfluous debate" even to MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, which expresses things that I personally find intolerable. For instance, the fact that "it can be argued to what extent the (Stalin's) tortures were justified from a moral point of view." If there are people who are prepared to argue, let them have the space to do so. But let them merely no do any more torturing...

It is quite a typical issue, I repeat, and it is not surprising in any way.

Apart from one letter printed in it which is perhaps worth quoting almost in full.

Like everything that is published in the periodical it has a very eloquent heading: "Stop Those who are Distorting Our Ideals..." It was sent in from abroad.

"We are extremely happy that this year we have subscribed to three good periodicals: MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, NASH SOVREMENNIK, and MOSKVA... There are old and young Communists in our family. We like the Soviet Union and the great and heroic Russian people very much!.. Progressive people throughout the world are astounded by what is happening in the Soviet Union. They expect that true Communists and nonparty Bolsheviks and honest and noble Russian and non-Russian people will not allow a catastrophe to happen. You have an obligation before all communists of all the countries in the world, and progressive people the world over, to stop those who are mocking the history of the Fatherland and undermining the ideals of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which are sacred to every honest person, whether Russian or foreign..."

An ordinary letter. It is quite typical of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA and its attitude toward the perestroyka that is currently taking place (toward "what is happening") in our country.

But the sender's address is not typical.

Bucharest, Romania.

The issue of the periodical was signed to press 24 November. Before the shooting of children in Timisoara, the bursts of submachine-gun fire, and before everything that we found out about those whose example in loyalty to "our ideals" we should—in the opinion of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA—emulate.

It is shameful...

I am not empowered by the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA editorial collegium to apologize to the Romanian people. But I will take the liberty of saying: what was published in the periodical has nothing to do with **OUR** ideals.

New Publication SOYUZ Available 5 Jan

LD0401221390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Tomorrow the stalls of the Soyuzpechat and the subscribers will receive the first issue of the weekly magazine SOYUZ. The main subject of this new publication, as its address to the readers says, is the development and strengthening of the Soviet Federation, the harmonization of the international relations, the life, the work and the concerns of all the peoples of the USSR. The editors invite to collobrate all those who care for our common home, our land, and the future of our children.

Judging from the first issue the new publication will probably be interesting. It contains materials that take us back to the days of the First Congress of the Soviets of the USSR, which announced the creation of our state; the correspondence presenting two viewpoints on Rukh—the people's movement of the Ukraine—for perestroyka, a topical piece of reporting from Lithuania; the inhabitants of Estonia answering the direct question about the probability of the republic's leaving the Union.

The interview with Vlasov, candidate member of the Politburo, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Russia, is dedicated to the problems of the Russian Federation. A talk with Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, is published under the header; we all are sailing in the same boat. In conclusion we can add that the subscription to the weekly SOYUZ—one copy costs 15 kopek—is accepted with no restriction by all branches of Soyuzpechat.

New Newspaper Issued in Latvia

LD0501122890 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 3 Jan 90

[Text] Today we received the first issue of the LATVIJAS JAUNATNE newspaper. Yesterday all the newspaper employees waited until late in the night for this first issue, which this morning was signed by all personnel in the editorial offic.

But today PADOMJU JAUNATNE, with its banner, Badge of Honor order, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree with Brezhnev's signature, made the journey to the Museum of Illegal Press. That's how it is, PADOMJU JAUNATNE now belongs to history.

Gosteleradio Head on Broadcast Plans

LD0301134190 Moscow GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA in Russian 1 Jan 90 p 2

[Interview with M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, Gosteleradio, by unidentified correspondent: "Priority for Those With Talent"—date and place of interview not given]

[Excerpts] In a few days the last leaf of this year's calendar will be turned over. What can viewers and listeners expect in the new year 1990? What are seen as the main trends for broadcasting? And what new programs will Soviet people be able to view and listen to? We asked these questions to M.F. Nenashev, chairman of USSR Gosteleradio. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] It is no easy matter for radio and television to satisfy all the variety of demands and interests of the Soviet people. Nevertheless, what is it that most often causes dissatisfaction among listeners and viewers? What are today's most typical complaints about radio and TV programs?

[Nenashev] It is indeed difficult to satisfy all the demands fully. I think it is even impossible. However, the existence of this contradiction, between what we bring to people and what they want, is the basic factor for the constant improvement and development of radio and TV media.

To try and somehow summarize the basic complaints that come in from listeners and viewers, going by their letters and referring to responses to sociological studies and appraisals in the press, these most often boil down to the shortcomings of news programs, their poor responsiveness, frequent inaccuracies, and the manifestations of subjective appraisals.

We have had a lot of comments about our arts and music programs. Listeners and viewers have, particularly lately, been expressing more and more serious dissatisfaction with the predominance of rock music and the reduction in attention to national and classical music. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] What new things will 1990 delight listeners and viewers with? What new broadcasts will be started and which thematic areas will be developed most?

[Nenashev] Radio and television news programs will be further developed in 1990. In particular, on television we intend to undertake practical steps to implement the principle of continuous information. To this end, in January 1990, apart from the existing Vremya program, three new news programs will be broadcast. The Sunday TV news program "7 Days" will be further developed and enhanced.

The news and journalism program "Morning" [Utro] (0630-0700 and 0730-0800) [0930-1000 and 1030-1100 GMT respectively] is being introduced daily except Sundays on Moscow 1 Radio beginning 1 January. At the same time, from January 1990 the new daily radio program "Companion" [sobesednik] is being introduced, and oriented toward elderly listeners—veterans of the war and of labor, and pensioners. Apart from information, it will also contain arts, literature, and music.

With the aim of developing and deepening the broad dialogue between party and state leaders and the working people, the political rostrum will be continued in 1990, and topical interviews and topical reportages will be presented regularly on television and radio.

We are planning great hopes for the interest and attention of listeners on a program that we call "Dialogues About the Party." We are currently shaping this program at the main editorial office for sociopolitical programs. We are forming a new group of production staff—editors and commentators—for it and we intend to involve a broad range of academics, writers, and journalists. We are very much hoping in this program for the support and participation of party workers, and of a broad range of communists and non-party members centrally and in the localities.

Despite all the difficulties, we are continuing the persistent endeavors in our "Sunday Moral Sermon," a complex program but one very necessary for the times. We understand how imperfect these homilies of ours still are, but, we realize their social significance and how needed they are in our times. We are continuing to search for new authors who are capable of becoming real father confessors.

At the end of 1989, a new production association "Sodruzhestvo" [Community] was formed at USSR Gosteleradio. It consists of two new main editorials—for television programs for Russian, and for television programs for the other national republics. This association will make its mark in 1990 with the opening of a new outlet "Sodruzhestvo," which will combine TV Programs of union republics which are of varied genre: concerts, feature films, and plays by oblast and republican theatres. A new program, "Sovetskaya Rossiya," will also start up in January, and will present the best works of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic's republican and oblast TV studios, a special news program and arts and music programs. [passage omitted]

And finally, I should speak about this: In order to better manage the creative process, in the new year we intend to plan our TV broadcasts in a different way. At the foundations of the new approach will be the principle of so-called block thematic broadcast planning, which means a rejection of the existing practice of necessarily fixing broadcasts to a definite slot for the whole year. Only some individual programs will be an exception. In the new planning system, a program's slot and its right to be produced will be determined by its rating [reyting] by the listener and viewer. The intent of this new approach

in planning TV broadcasts boils down to overcoming the monopoly of production offices, and within the production offices the monopoly of presenters of individual programs. The intent here is to build the creative process on an alternative basis, so that priority goes to creativeness, talent, and high professional standards, and so that it is these qualities which determine a program's place and its right to be broadcast.

RSFSR Video Channel to Start 7 Jan

LD0401175190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0330 GMT 4 Jan 90

[From the "120 minutes" program]

[Excerpt] [Announcer Vladimir Stefanov] There was a time when the borderline between such concepts as "Soviet" and "Russian" [Rossiyskiy] began to be erased. Yes, and the very word—you must agree—the word Russia itself has somehow started to disappear from our everyday lives. The last few years have shown that the borderline, if it exists—I stress that it is borderline and not border—and thank God that this borderline does exist, and we have started to think in earnest about setting up some kind of institutions, republican institutions, political systems, cultural and scientific establishments. [sentence as heard]

Well, you know of course, that a decision has been adopted, for example, on setting up a Russian bureau of the CPSU Central Committee. There is serious talk of the need to revive the Russian Academy of Sciences.

And here is a fact that has already been accomplished. Here at the Central Television station the main editorial office of television programs for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. On Sunday, 7 January a Russian video channel will go on the air for the first time. In the future, probably in about 2 years, this video channel, the Russian video channel, will in fact become a separate television program. But for the moment it will operate within the framework of the Second All-Union program.

Presently in the operations room of the Ostankino television center the first program on this video channel is being put together. [passage omitted]

Economic

Association Chairman Comments on Grain Imports

904B0075A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 2

[Interview with O.A. Klimov, chairman of the USSR foreign economic association "Eksportkhleb," by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent P. Babichev: "Grain From Abroad"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is SELSKAYA ZHIZN introduction]

[Text] Food for thought: The Soviet Union gathers more wheat than the United States of America. The annual harvest obtained, as a rule, exceeds the gross product of all the EEC countries combined. However, we buy grain from them, and not the reverse. This was the subject of discussion when our correspondent interviewed the chairman of the All-Union Foreign Economic Association "Eksportkhleb," O.A. Klimov.

[Babichev] L.I. Brezhnev issued the call in his time: "There will be bread and there will be song." Today, however, our poets have lost interest in composing this kind of verse. What is this related to, in your view?

[Klimov] Cautious treatment of grain is the standard of authority of any peasant. Tearing the peasant away from the land, however, turned him into a worker for hire and caused a corresponding deformation in his psychology. This deformation had an influence on creative circles as well: Why sing the praises of the tiller of the soil when he has no respect for himself? Recent press reports flashed the following periodic data: grain losses associated with reaping, transporting, and storing the harvest amount to 29 million tons. This came with an average annual crop of around 200 million tons.

We can increase grain yield if we extend the complete, necessary independence to kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms]. We are confronted with the fact that the true peasant has practically disappeared and it will take years before this social group is restored. This is why the hope for establishment of small, individual farmsteads for grain production is rather illusory. In my opinion, our reference point in this regard should be support for the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, which have operated successfully in previous years and have experienced managers who feel they are masters of the land. But they must be assisted with reliable technology, means of transportation, road construction, and allocation of construction materials. We must get rid of wage-leveling.

Indeed it is not fashionable in the literature and music of today to sing the praises of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Many people have put on other blinders and prefer to see everything good in the West. This is a reaction to the period of stagnation, and it is unfair to those who pour their sweat into the harvest in our country, who have remained in the village and rural areas and not vanished to the city. If we want to achieve improvement in agriculture and bring about a rebirth of the peasant, then in addition to beating ourselves bitterly on the chest and engaging in the self-criticism we Russians have always had a reputation for, it is time to return to the verse and songs about those who work the land.

[Babichev] Oleg Aleksandrovich, would you please name for us the largest exporters and importers of grain?

[Klimov] The leading world exporter of grain is the United States, with a grand network of grain elevators and the most significant grain reserves. In recent years the Americans have been exporting 90-100 million tons each year. The EEC nations, Canada, Australia, and

Argentina deliver a significant quantity of grain. Of the socialist countries, the greatest volume of exports comes from China (fodder grain).

Importers are the USSR, Japan, the People's Republic of China (wheat), Egypt, Iran, and Saudi Arabia.

[Babichev] Russia was traditionally an exporter of grain. Bread (in spite of the years of starvation) was delivered abroad during Stalin's time. Would you please comment on this.

[Klimov] With its huge territory suitable for agriculture, Russia traditionally exported wheat, rye, barley, and oats. Deliveries in the years 1909-1913 amounted to about 10.5 million tons per year.

Grain export in 1928-1929 was insignificant. Two years later it had grown to 5 million tons annually. During the period 1932 through 1941, grain exports fluctuated from 300,000 to 2 million tons per year.

Grain export at the beginning of the 1930's was related to the policy of accelerating industrialization of the country and with the need to find funds to pay for equipment imported from the capitalist countries. The state was unable during those years to secure long-term loans from abroad to cover the necessary imports.

During the postwar period, there was a rebirth in the export of grain on a broad scale in 1948 and this continued to the mid-1970's within the limits of 3.2-8.5 million tons. The chief purchasers of the grain were the socialist countries, with whom delivery obligations existed on the basis of intergovernmental protocols. Part of the grain was exported to the West European countries with payment in freely convertible currency.

[Babichev] Who issued the first document on the import of grain and when was this done? What were the circumstances under which the exception became the rule?

[Klimov] We have been making small grain purchases for a long time. But grain imports on a large scale began at the end of 1963 when, by decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, delivery of wheat was begun from the United States and Canada. That year 3.1 million tons of wheat were imported and, in 1964, 7.3 million tons. It was not until 1972, however, that the import of grain acquired a systematic nature and was accomplished on a particularly large scale—15.5 million tons were imported that year, including 8.1 million tons of wheat and 7.4 million tons of fodder grain. In 1984-1985, the volume of grain purchases amounted to about 46 million tons per year. This was the maximum level of our import.

[Babichev] The foreign press has published quite a lot of material on the alarming situation regarding the world grain economy. The United States, Canada, and even China are steadily decreasing their production of grains. Since 1984 grain yield has fallen 14%. The trend can hardly be viewed with optimism, wouldn't you say?

[Klimov] Whereas at the close of the 1986-1987 agricultural season, grain stores in the major grain exporting countries amounted to 252 million tons (202 million in the United States), it is expected that the level of these reserves will be reduced to 104 million tons at the end of 1988-1989 (67 million tons in the United States). One of the chief factors causing this reduction is the drought which took place in North America in the summer of 1988.

Nevertheless, we must not forget that within the United States and the countries of Western Europe, which are the main exporters of grain, the amount of land for planting, internal price level, and production are rigidly controlled by government organizations and the reduced output is planned to a significant degree.

This year the U.S. Department of Agriculture (which for many years implemented the government's policy of decreasing the area under planting) permitted farmers to increase the size of areas under planting by 5% in 1990.

The Common Market countries have determined an optimal variant for production of grains—160 million tons per year—and are adhering to that level. Argentina, Australia, and other countries have great potential for increasing their production of grain.

[Babichev] We are making purchases in the Chicago grain market "on preferential terms." What does this consist of?

[Klimov] It is important to note that the exchange market by itself cannot afford anyone any "preferential terms" whatsoever. In 1988-1989 we obtained "preferential terms" from the American Government regarding purchases of wheat in the United States. The U.S. Government extended subsidies to its commercial firms so that they would be able to sell wheat in the USSR at prices lower than their domestic-market prices. Over this period the Soviet Union imported 17.5 million tons of grain under such conditions and saved R300 million.

[Babichev] Are there any changes being made because of the current crop, any corrections to the process of grain export and import?

[Klimov] According to the latest estimates of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, our harvest will amount to 205 million tons of grain. Presently we have made fodder grain purchases for delivery the end of this year, beginning of next year, as decided by the USSR Council of Ministers. Further determination of the country's grain balance will depend on the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Babichev] Prices for raw materials are an unstable element. As suppliers, we got burned quite heavily in the oil business. Now, similarly, we have to pay out as importers of grain. The decrease in production of grains, soil erosion on a grand scale, and droughts in the grain-producing countries (United States, Canada, and elsewhere) are changing the market situation in a manner

disadvantageous to the USSR: Grain prices have shot upwards. Can you indicate graphically the changes in these prices during the last 5 years?

[Klimov] Certainly. Here you see the dynamics of world prices for these agricultural years based on delivery to Rotterdam in rubles per ton:

wheat, fodder grain: 1984/85—129.0, 119.7; 1985/86—105.5, 89.5; 1986/87—90.0, 59.1; 1987/88—87.6, 61.1; 1988/89—119.4; 87.1.

[Babichev] Why are we importing strong and hard varieties of wheat at a time when, judging from disturbing letters to our editors, such production is being fed to our cattle?

[Klimov] I think this might be better answered by employees of the former USSR Ministry of Grain Products. As far as the information I have available is concerned, state requisitions do not satisfy the domestic demand of our baking and food industry. Let me note in passing that state standards and our baking production output are calculated based on the use of high-quality wheat. Unfortunately, we do not make adequate use of the technology of baking bread from ordinary soft wheat and using enhancement additives. This results in "Eksportkhleb" requisitions involving the delivery of strong and hard wheat.

I hope that the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers issued 8 August 1989 on the purchase of high-quality wheat grain for currency will enable us to correct the situation and increase the shipment of such types of grain to state reserves. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have obtained the opportunity and the right to acquire any goods from abroad, from equipment to consumer goods. No limitations are envisaged. Monies are transferred only to the accounts of the immediate producers and sellers of the grain—kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and agricultural industry firms. Our association is prepared to provide assistance in the use of currency, and not simply transfer it to accounts. We have already circulated the appropriate information to republic and oblast organizations of the agricultural and grain-products industry. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes also can come directly to us.

[Babichev] Could you cite a specific example to show how much and what kinds of consumer goods could be acquired for that R5 billion certain sources indicate are being spent on grain imports?

[Klimov] We spent that much at the beginning of the 1980's, when we imported 45-46 million tons of grain. In 1988, 35 million tons of grain were imported for 2.35 billion. The average import efficiency for consumer goods from the capitalist countries, according to statistical data, amounts to about 600%. In other words, it would have been possible last year to deliver about R14 billion worth of consumer goods (at domestic prices) by virtue of our grain imports. But I am against making such comparisons. Shoes do not replace your piece of bread and piece of meat on the table.

[Babichev] Is there a scientifically based program for bringing our grain purchases down to a minimum?

[Klimov] The development of long-range plans in our country falls under the jurisdiction of USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]. Not long ago S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, voiced the opinion that by the end of the 5-year plan we should have completely abolished grain imports. Execution of a program to terminate bread imports from abroad will depend on our agricultural workers, as well as on the support of other branches of the national economy which supply kolkhozes and sovkhozes with necessary products and equipment.

Effectiveness of Currency Reform Debated

904A0107A Moscow TRUD in Russian
16 Dec 89 p 2

[Article by TRUD correspondent: "Money Reform: Yes or No?"]

[Text] As recently as two days ago, Deputy G.Kh. Popov suggested in his speech at the Congress that a money reform should be conducted in the country. Talking to TRUD correspondents, he expressed very little faith in its effectiveness himself, but he still feels that this method should be tried because the people have certain expectations from it. Yesterday, the idea was reiterated by the speakers more than once. Deputy V.P. Filippov from Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] is quite convinced that a money reform based on regressive exchange is morally justified. Such a move, as you know, was rejected by the government. But the deputy thinks that such a measure will deal a direct blow on the shadow economy.

Yes or no? That was the subject of our discussions with many deputies during the break in the session. A worker of the Kirov factory from Leningrad says:

"Being a deputy of the trade union, I support the idea of the reform. Some deputies are apprehensive that it will affect us—the workers. It will not: What kind of savings can I have with my salary of R250? But the mafia should be exposed."

"They say that 5% of the population has hundreds of billions of rubles in its possession," is the opinion of the manager of state stock-breeding factory from Mordovia, Deputy A.V. Dolganov.

"I wouldn't rush into a reform," says a machine-operator from the Kherson area, Deputy A.F. Nikolayenko. "Those who have saved their hard-earned money can suffer now; they will have to explain where the money is coming from, but a crook will find a way out."

Deputy from the trade unions, member of the Supreme Soviet, V.E. Kurtashin supports the idea of a reform on the whole but he is also against taking this step rashly, he sees the necessity of consulting experts, economists and workers.

Deputy N.I. Travkin is in a more decisive mood:

"I understand that it seems very appealing to take the money away from underground millionaires. But none of them is going to give himself or his money up willingly."

Deputy N.P. Shmelev, an economist, answered our question with a question:

"Do you have any idea how to arrange this exchange in practice? I don't. How do you prevent a crook from asking some old women to exchange for a certain fee his unrighteous thousands into the new money? I am sure that the effectiveness of such a reform will be minimal and will not justify the expenditures—by these I mean loss of confidence in the government, unavoidable panic and further worsening of the consumer goods situation."

"And the main thing is," an employee of a cultural establishment from the Kaliningrad Oblast, Deputy V.A. Voblikov, says, "that such an action will not change the system of economy which breeds inflation and allows people to get paid for doing nothing. Some experts estimate that there are some 36 million of the 'latent' unemployed. They are the people who occupy working places and positions but are of no use whatever. The system has to be changed; we have to introduce such mechanisms in the market that would establish a mutual dependence between the results of a person's work and his well-being. All kinds of exchanges will bring no result; we will just waste time and lose the people's confidence."

A deputy from Leningrad, A.A. Sobchak, gave a definite answer to the question about his attitude towards a money reform:

"It is negative. The reform should have been carried out two years ago. Now it is too late. All this money has been invested in production means, in cooperatives, in combined enterprises. It was possible to pull this money out before the spread of the cooperative movement. Another thing is that measures of such nature are not decided at congresses and are not announced beforehand because crooks always think faster than other people. They would invest their money in real estate or disperse it and the simple people will be the ones that will suffer from the reform as the market always reacts to any money reform by a spontaneous price increase. So, this measure is illusory; it means nothing. We have to do something different. We should take away the right of the government to put money into circulation without any control. Money issue should be controlled by the Supreme Soviet so that every additional ruble could be printed only with the parliament's approval. Because now we print money for any of our needs, even the most absurd ones, for instance, to raise the salaries of the management. Where did they find this kind of money with the budget deficit that we have? The idea of a money reform appeals to the public because they do not understand its mechanism and results."

A deputy from Moscow, member of the Supreme Soviet M.A. Bocharov, expressed his complete agreement with A.A. Sobchak's point of view:

"Our people have gotten the impression that we can have a reform and withdraw the money from the shadow economy. It is a misleading impression. The shadow economy works beautifully and knows how to safeguard itself. I do not think that it involves a lot of cash resources, the money has been invested for a long time. You must also take into account the possibility to acquire hard currency for which wonderful channels have been found. Therefore, the mafia will not suffer. Those who will suffer are the people who spend years saving some money. They hope to buy furniture, a house, a car and save every kopeck, and now they will have to either lose it all or try to explain where it came from. I do not think this is right."

The viewpoints are extreme opposites. So what does the government think about it? There was a press-conference during a break in the session. L.I. Abalkin firmly said: "The negative consequences of a money reform are obvious to us, and the government is going to defend its position to the end."

Quality of Economic Laws Concerns Minister

904A0106A Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 50, Dec 89 p 9

[Article by USSR Minister of Justice V. Yakovlev: "From Instructions to Law"]

[Text] The very best economic concepts can perish merely because the proper logistical and legal mechanisms for implementing them have not been created. Therefore, today, the joint work of economists and lawyers and the integration of efforts to create legal support for reform are more important than ever before.

No serious economic transformations are possible without the development of appropriate laws. Now, a kind of "euphoria of law" has appeared: We have become extremely fascinated with the creation of law. This is understandable, and it can be explained: Actually, our economy has not been regulated by law until the present time.

As is known, economic relations can be managed in two ways: by means of commands from the center, or by means of their legislative regulation. The administrative-command system is characterized first and foremost by the fact that economic relations are regulated by orders issued from the center. Products that are produced and the income that is obtained are distributed by orders from above. As a result of this, a verticalization of economic relations takes place; normal economic exchange is interrupted; and it does not work. The

system of economic stimulation of production on the part of the consumer ceases to exist. We have to replace the command system of management with standards of legislative regulation, not so much vertical as much as horizontal relations—property relationships, and goods and money exchange.

This will require the establishment of optimal relationships of centralized and decentralized regulation and a change in the very character of centralized influence, replacing orders and instructions with laws. Only then will it be possible to speak of a valuable socialist market.

Not long ago I became acquainted with the system of regulating land ownership relations in Switzerland. There is property of the federation, cantons, and cities. There is also private property. Moreover, private ownership of land is so regulated by law that a person cannot in any way use his rights to the detriment of society. To exploit agriculturally designated land for purposes other than the production of agricultural products requires the permission of the appropriate state organ. In addition, the entire system of economic regulation is changed, and the taxes levied on the property owner are increased sharply. In my opinion, we should create such a perfected system. Otherwise, only slogans will be all that remains of all of our reforms.

The most important task is the quality of the law. The laws that came out recently were far from perfect. More than anything, they resembled editorials in newspapers: slogans, declarations, and appeals. But the law is a concrete mechanism for influencing economic relations. It should state the specific right, and the judicial basis for the origin of this right, measures for its protection when it is breached, and quite specific obligations and responsibilities for their nonfulfillment. And until such laws are created, I am confident that reform will not budge from the spot.

For whom has the producer worked up until now? In effect, for indices sent down from above. Because his economic welfare depended on their fulfillment. Now we have to see to it that the producer works for the consumer. And this will require the replacement of vertical ties with horizontal ties.

But what does this denote from a legal standpoint? Vertical relations were regulated mainly by administrative law. This was obvious, because there was a preponderance of administrative law in the economy.

But horizontal economic ties are regulated by another sphere of law: by civil law. It requires an absolutely different set of instruments. Civil law in the economy and the appropriate set of instruments, of course, exist in our country, although they are pushed aside by administrative-legal regulation. We must force this set of instruments to work.

I will note that the relationships of property and commodity-money relationships, and civil law along with this, have existed throughout all human history. Civil law economy also exists in the economy of both a capitalist and a socialist society. It consists of the legal ability of the citizen, the legal person, the right of property, deals, contracts, obligations, and compensation for losses. But, you see, we have all of this! All that has to be done is to develop the existing legal instrument and to fill it with economic content. Then it will start to work. And economic reform will develop along with it.

Considering the importance of the legal regulation of economic relations, the USSR Ministry of Justice sees as its main task today the improvement of the existing laws and the development of principally new laws. Of course, this is being done in close association with the appropriate committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and in contact with other ministries and departments.

Specialists of the ministry participated in the development of laws that have already been adopted or approved, or that are being examined by legislative organs, on property in the USSR, on the socialist enterprise, on a single tax system, on the quality of products, and on the protection of the rights of the consumer. It is not possible not to remark on the role of the Ministry of Justice in the preparation of the Principles of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics concerning land, leasing, the general principles of management of the economy and the social sphere in the union and in autonomous republics, and the general principles of local self-government and the local economy. Our ministry also participated in the development of a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning the taxation of the wage payment fund of state enterprises (associations). At the present time, lawyers are working on a draft Principles of Civil Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics, on laws on the protection of the environment, on the use of poisonous chemicals in agricultural production, and about securities and a stock exchange, and others.

The Ministry of Justice was the initiator of the creation of a number of principal new draft laws. Related to these are laws on joint stock companies and other economic partnerships, and on joint enterprises with participation by Soviet and foreign firms and organizations on the territory of the USSR. Finally, the ministry is participating in work on the systematization of economic legislation and the reworking of materials of the USSR Code of Laws. As new acts are developed and adopted, previous acts in force are being reviewed, and recommendations are being made concerning their abrogation or their appropriate modification.

Moves To Protect Foreign Investment Discussed

LD0401111290 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 4 TASS—By TASS economic analyst Yuriy Stepanov:

Many foreign investors find it difficult to overcome fears about the stability of the Soviet foreign economic policy, possible returns and guarantees for withdrawing their investments.

Most often they invest small sums that are mostly directed to service or consumer goods industries, which guarantee quick profits.

The Soviet Union is now working to make its markets more attractive to foreign investors.

The signing of inter-state agreements on the mutual protection of investment is one of such measures.

Nearly a year ago the Soviet Union signed an "intergovernmental agreement to promote and protect capital investment" with Finland, the first such accord with a Western state.

The fact that the treaty was signed with Finland reflects the scope of trade and the dynamism of political relations between neighbouring Finland and the USSR.

Soviet economic perestroika and its growing involvement in foreign economic relations have made the Soviet market more appealing to foreigners.

This prompted a need for state guarantees against certain risks, such as the nationalisation of foreign property.

Similar agreements with seven more countries—Belgium, Britain, West Germany, France, Holland, Italy and Canada—were signed in 1989.

Inter-governmental agreements on the mutual protection of investments guarantee that foreigners investing in the Soviet economy will be able to take their profits out. They help settle disputes between investors and the state and outline the sphere of activity for foreign business in the Soviet Union.

In addition to regulating procedures for setting up joint ventures on Soviet territory, they also set rules for joint business abroad, such as joint stock companies with Soviet participation.

The Soviet Union will continue to work on such agreements in 1990 and is expected to sign them with Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Sweden and Kuwait, according to officials in the Soviet Finance Ministry.

Scientific

Glavkosmos Chief Defends Space Budget, Goals

907Q0035A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 51, 20 Dec 89 p 11

[Interview with Aleksandr Dunayev, chief of the USSR Glavkosmos, by scientific observer Oleg Moroz: "Can We Save in Space?"]

[Text] [Moroz] At first I tried to telephone you on the "private line." Your "private line" secretary, sitting in the Ministry of General Machine Building, spoke in a very friendly manner and said that at that moment you were in Glavkosmos [Main Administration for the Development and Use of Space Technology for the National Economy and Scientific Research]. She advised me to call there using the city telephone. I telephoned. There the conversation was quite different, quite rude. The secretary there said that although you were there she was unwilling to connect me to you, and she talked in this vein: "So many people call here..." (even though I had identified myself as the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA scientific observer and had at least 6 million readers behind me). Is it that this courtesy and friendliness are shown to a "selected" public (who else would use the "private line"?) and the rudeness toward someone "not special" is the usual style of Glavkosmos work?

[Dunayev] How can I answer you? If I say "no" you will not believe me, but I cannot say "yes" because in fact the answer is "no." It is simply a random thing that people in any particular apparatus turn out to be educated in different ways. But rudeness is unforgivable in anyone, and if in fact this occurred as you said it did, then please accept my apologies. One explanation—not an excuse—for this response by the secretary to your call could be the fact that very many people do call, and there are many visitors. We receive about 800 foreigners each year alone and we have only 35 associates. In addition to telephone conversations and receiving guests, we still have our business to carry on. Here I am talking to you on a Saturday, but I also will have to work on Sunday. Lack of order, of course, but how else can it be if 5 days are not enough?

[Moroz] Let us turn to our subject. We have heard many calls recently to cut back spending on space. Does it not in fact seem to you a crime that a country such as ours, where people are short of necessities and where there is a budget deficit—R120 billion—cannot allow itself such spending on space flights? This year some R6.9 billion has been spent on all space programs, an enormous sum, even though people do not really believe that figure. I suspect that the space budget, like the defense budget in the past, is invisibly dispersed to many other areas. In any event the spending is colossal, and this comes at a time when the dregs are being gathered together for low-income pensioners....

[Dunayev] We spend very little on space: This year R1.7 billion is being spent on national economic and scientific tasks, and R1.3 billion on the multi-use "Buran." Well, what of the R6.9 billion? (This figure, I assure you, is reliable.) Set it alongside the losses in national economic output, which according to the scholars is up to R25 billion, or the U.S. space budget of $29.6 billion this year. I am not talking about the ruble-dollar exchange rate, but just citing the figures for a comparison that perhaps says much.

[Moroz] Why compare us with America—a rich and flourishing country, while we are poor....

[Dunayev] I believe that this is clear to everyone that for peace in the world and to maintain the level of security for the country at least at its present level, we must preserve parity—in both civilian space and military space. And to preserve it with such funding! Previously, when we managed to do this, it was primarily thanks to the selfless labor and talent of our engineers, scientists, workers, and production organizers. This was not at all thanks to generous funding. It was not simple. You can compare our military spending in space with this year's figures: R3.9 billion and $22.8 billion.

[Moroz] How much money is proposed for next year?

[Dunayev] The budget envisages a 10 percent reduction. However, some members of the Supreme Soviet have demanded and are demanding even greater cuts in our budget.

[Moroz] Even given that less money is being spent for space, each year our number of launches is at least five times greater than that of the rest of the world. Is this not a paradox?

[Dunayev] A seeming paradox. In order to reduce the number of launches it would be necessary to increase the lifespans of satellites—that is, spend considerable sums on new technology.

But overall we are not launching five times more than the rest of the world. In 1988 we carried out 90 launches, and other countries had 26....

[Moroz] Well fine, something is needed for defense, for the national economy, and for science. But how many costly and ambitious projects have there been whose purpose was merely to show and prove and demonstrate... and now again—an expedition to Mars. Can our unhappy people afford this when they cannot even buy soap? We are talking about tens of billions of rubles! What in general can be said about this now?

[Dunayev] Our proposal for a joint expedition to Mars should be regarded as an alternative to SDI—the notorious Star Wars program. I suggest that there is no need to explain the significance of this. At the same time we should distinguish between two aspects of the "Mars" program—the technical and the economic. As for the technical aspect, if we start work today and combine the efforts of various countries, first and foremost the USSR and the United States, then somewhere around the year 2015 to 2017 it will be possible to make a manned flight to Mars with a crew of three or four. With respect to the economic aspect, we have always said that this is an enormous, multibillion program. According to union republic estimates, the entire program will cost from R50 billion to R70 billion. The Americans think that it will cost up to $100 billion.

Let me emphasize once again that we have never said that we shall travel only to Mars. And when M.S. Gorbachev made the proposal to prepare for such a flight he was talking precisely about international cooperation in this field and the need to combine all the minds of the space experts on earth for the sake of this goal.

[Moroz] You have obviously offered appropriate proposals to M.S. Gorbachev. Does it not seem to you that you have placed him in an awkward position, given the economic disorganization that we are experiencing, to talk about a flight to Mars—a flight which requires such a sum, which, of course, will grow as things move ahead and which we must provide half. A total of R50 billion—these are not pennies.

[Dunayev] I do not think that spaceflights are an extravagance. Space research has been, and will be, a powerful incentive for scientific and technical progress. If we apply the brakes in leading sectors then there will be even greater sluggishness in all the others, and, of course, in the economy as a whole. In this sense we have not placed the leadership in an awkward position. The proposal was greeted with understanding throughout the world. It was not detailed, but everyone understood that preparations for the flight are a prolonged process that depends on the state of the economy. Today we are committed to the concept of bringing mankind closer to this goal—a flight to Mars—in line with its material resources. Currently, we first plan to send an unmanned vehicle to Mars in 1994. Some R50 million will be needed for this program in 1990 alone. We are being given R20 million less, and we have not yet received even a kopeck for the scientific work and for the design work that we must start right now.

[Moroz] Perhaps the only people's deputy to defend space research at the first Congress of People's Deputies was the economist Professor G. Popov. The essence of his argument was that space research is one of just a few fields where we are ahead, so why not work on it further and develop it more and take advantage of its position to move ahead and derive a commercial profit from it? But this is the opinion of an expert in the humanities and is far removed from the subject of our conversation. Are we in fact ahead in space technology? When they review our space program, experts in the West always unanimously emphasize that it makes use of "quite technologically modest facilities" (but when they praise us this always gives rise to the suspicion that while they approve, they simply are trying to get money for their own space research work)....

[Dunayev] According to the statistics our launch vehicles are the most reliable in the world. The design of the "Energiya" launch vehicle and its engines and the philosophy behind it are very highly assessed in the West... so here we remain competitive. Where we are behind—and experts in the West talk openly about this and we are aware of it—is in computers and the maintenance of equipment. When it is a question of satellites, particularly the length of their useful life, they reproach us for the low level of our microelectronics. But this is our common trouble, not just in space technology.

Right from the start our sector faced a very severe requirement—namely, to develop launch vehicles and space equipment using only Soviet-made developments, materials, equipment, resources, and technology. The United States was in a much more advantageous position: While having its own highly developed industry and unique scientific centers, it was at the same time able to borrow the latest achievements from other countries and recruit eminent foreign experts.

[Moroz] Notwithstanding, what do we have to trade with? What is competitive in the world market?

[Dunayev] We are offering the world community an extensive range of commercial services connected with the use of space technology, and we have achieved this sometimes. But it is not very easy. For example, the most profitable business is in launching communications satellites into geostationary orbits. Each such launch generates an income of about $80 million. Starting in 1986 we have been offering our services in this field to all countries. But the fact is that all satellites in the world have American components, and despite the thaw in relations between our countries, the United States will not give permission to import those satellites into the USSR; there is a tight embargo on technology transfer. So that here what we are talking about is not competition but artificial restrictions set by politicians. There are about 150 communications satellites in the world, but we have not launched a single one of them.

[Moroz] As I understand it, our own communications satellites are not as good as foreign ones.

[Dunayev] Yes. The "Gorizont" was built 10 years ago and today is obsolete in terms of some of its parameters....

[Moroz] In general we hear about the unusually high level of space technology. A space vehicle is certainly more advanced than a domestic iron or a vacuum cleaner. But breakdowns in space are not a rarity; just take the recent loss of the two "Phobos" vehicles. How much of the people's money is being wasted?

[Dunayev] The most likely reason for the failure of the final part of the "Phobos" program was the general unreliability of our electronics. But we are not excluding another cause. We had complete knowledge of the situation around the Martian satellite. How do you think such a survey could be made? Was it because the scientists did not tell us that there are hundreds of tons of matter there in a atomized state? Was it because we were not warned that there is an enormous effect there from the streams of solar radiation, or particularly heavy particles—protons and neutrons?

We are, of course, not absolving ourselves from blame. Given all the circumstances, after the vehicle had lost orientation, we were wrong not to restore it quickly.

And of course, one final point: In general I do not believe that the "Phobos" program was a failure. The Americans, for example, are suggesting that only one-fourth of the program was not completed. The French are talking about its "very rich results." How was it a failure? A series of unique data of enormous interest to the entire world was obtained.

Regarding domestic irons and vacuum cleaners, the enterprises in our sector are producing irons and vacuum cleaners that are being purchased with satisfaction abroad, for hard currency, at world prices, and output is being increased.

[Moroz] What was the purpose of building the gigantic "Energiya" launch vehicle? What will it carry into space? The feeling is that the only goal being pursued was to surpass the Americans (their launch vehicle of the same class was the Saturn-5). Also, what was the purpose of the "Buran," which is a copy of the shuttle? Again, was it to prove that we are not lagging behind the Americans? We are just showing off what we have done to someone, that is all.

Can it be, do you think, that the world does not see who we really are? It has been calculated that lifting a payload using the "Buran" will be 20 to 40 times more costly than using conventional launch vehicles. Again, why are they necessary?

[Dunayev] The irony is that we have always said that the "Energiya-Buran" system should not be regarded as a transport system ("what will it carry?"); it will be considerably more costly than conventional launch vehicles, and now these very arguments are being used against us: We have made a mistake, they say. We have made no mistake. The "Energiya-Buran" system was conceived primarily for defense purposes and it was deemed quite essential, and all other issues (and you understand this well) were to be secondary.

Does this mean that the system has no peaceful application? It is impossible to imagine that. A great deal has already been said about various versions....

You are comparing "Energiya" to the U.S. Saturn 5 launch vehicle, which can lift about the same payload. Some people also recall the similar N-1 launch vehicle, whose flight tests were halted 15 years ago. How correct are these comparisons? How successful can you be in comparing the "Zhiguli" car with the prewar "Emka," which carried the same weight. The "Energiya" is a new-generation launch vehicle.

[Moroz] The diverse and fantastic applications for the new system lie in the future. But now the "Energiya" and the "Buran" are sitting on earth with no purpose or destination, taking up a pile of the people's immobilized money. Incidentally, how much did they cost?

[Dunayev] During the 13 years of development and building, R14 billion were spent. The cost of the first launch was R350 million. Returning the "Buran" to

earth costs R140 million. In other words, the net cost is R210 million. We hope to recoup that money. A start already has been made to return it to the state; 581 proposals have been made to other industrial sectors to introduce the latest technologies, materials, and structures worked on during development of the system. The expected savings from proposals already adopted is hundreds of millions of rubles. Next year we hope to recoup at least R6 billion, and the total R14 billion by the year 2000.

[Moroz] During the launch of gigantic vehicles like the "Energiya" the atmosphere crackles and the ozone layer sizzles. The Americans believe that in order to loft into orbit a vehicle that will fly to Mars it will be necessary to launch the "Energiya" fifteen or twenty times. Are we preparing finally to destroy the earth's atmosphere and resettle on Mars?

Incidentally, there are reports in the West that the "Energiya" may become a multistage carrier, an even bigger launch vehicle. The poor ozone layer! Poor people!

[Dunayev] It is primarily nitrogen and chlorine that harm the atmosphere. But we use mainly cryogenic fuels—oxygen and hydrogen, and partly kerosene. These are all ecologically clean fuels. The harm—dreadful harm—comes from launching solid-fuel carrier vehicles. And, as is known, in the United States extensive use is made of solid-fuel rockets and boosters. In a single launch, like the splendid launch of the "Atlantis" that we recently saw on television, hundreds of thousands of tons of ozone are destroyed. About 300 launches of the shuttle each year would be a catastrophe and the ozone would be completely destroyed.

[Moroz] The shuttle, of course, can be criticized. Nevertheless, we are convinced that we need independent ecological inspections, just as in major construction projects.

[Dunayev] I do not object, but I do say with a full and proper sense of responsibility that we are always thinking about the environment and include it in all projects. The newspapers have already written that if we take as a criterion of ecological damage the amount of ozone destroyed per unit of payload, the "Energiya" launch vehicle is cleaner than the shuttle by a factor of about 7,000. True, by the same criterion our other launch vehicle, the "Proton," is about 2.5 times dirtier than the "Energiya," but even it is thousands of times cleaner than launch vehicles such as the "Delta" and the "Arianne" used in the West. The task now is to do further work on the "Proton" to improve environmental safety.

[Moroz] How many "Proton" launches have there now been? Dozens?

[Dunayev] Well, we all grow wiser gradually. When the "Proton" was being developed, environmental issues were not being raised so acutely.

Now the question is whether the "Energiya" will be built up. The designers are thinking about it, of course. Designers always are thinking about the future. But nothing practical has been done. We think it is too early. This kind of launch vehicle will be needed, we assume, when it is a question of developing a power station in space with fields of solar structures dozens of kilometers long....

[Moroz] Space research emerged as a by-product of the arms race. (One of Kurchatov's associates told me how after the development of the ICBM Korolev went to Kurchatov and, using a globe of the earth, he began to measure intercontinental distances across which a missile could deliver atomic playthings. It was only then that the first satellite appeared.) To what extent today is space research delineated by the solution of military tasks? What percentage of launches are for peaceful purposes?

[Dunayev] I would not say that space research is a by-product of armaments. It would be more accurate to say that both avenues—the dreams of the peaceful opening up of space, and the desire to acquire powerful weapons—have been developed side by side. It is another matter that dreams are the field of the ideal, and the ideal is always weaker than what relies on the down-to-earth, realistic approach. Yes, at the time of the birth of practical space research, immediate defense goals were being given priority. Yes, the first satellite was lofted by a launch vehicle developed as a strategic weapon. But this does not mean that at that moment they were not also looking beyond, to the more remote goals of space work for peaceful purposes.

Now about one-third of our launches are for peaceful purposes, at least in terms of expenditures, and sometimes more (for scientific satellites). The rest are for defense purposes.

This year the proportion of spending for military space purposes is about 56 percent. The direction in which the relations of these figures lean depends not on us and not on those directly involved in space rocket technology, but on trends in the development of big politics and on the success or failure in disarmament negotiations.

[Moroz] Tsiolkovskiy and the science fiction writers dreamed about space flight as about some kind of radiant, festive thing that elevated the soul. Today it must be recognized that this is not the case. Space research is a half-hidden, arcane, buttoned-up affair occupied by the undertaking's tedious officials. An undertaking shrouded in total secrecy and guarded by draconian censorship that stands apart from the Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press, until just recently allowed through, literally as if through a filter, only light of a rose-colored hue. Will there be changes here?

[Dunayev] Real life is always distinguished from what the science fiction writers dream. In one sense it is also tedious and gray. But man has always been able to make

out the bright colors in it. More so in space research. We have now simply forgotten what a festival it was not so long ago for millions of people. We have forgotten because today it has become a routine matter.

With reference to glasnost, we have started to develop it through a number of firsts, particularly since the first joint missions. They have talked openly everywhere about what we are doing. Over the years the veil of secrecy has become less and less. Today we can read about our unsuccessful moon program and about the N-1 rocket, about the various undertakings in the sector and about its leading scientists and experts. Finally, we have familiarized journalists with the program for the development of space research for the period from 1991 to 2005. (Incidentally, the accusations made against us that in the past we had no long-term space programs are ridiculous: Some of those who today are leveling these accusations have themselves, among others, subscribed to those programs, like annual and 5-year plans, and have evidently forgotten about it.)

In the field of so-called censorship none of those writing about space research have any problems at all. For the last 1 and ½ to 2 years we have been concerned with only one thing: To prevent, if you will excuse me, the telling of many lies about historical and technical details. It is harmful when people lie.

[Moroz] Do you maintain a special censorship department merely to catch blunders? In this case you must extend censorship to all subjects—physics, chemistry, history, geography, international affairs, for blunders also occur there.

[Dunayev] We are prepared to provide information just as openly as the Americans do. They report everything in detail: Today at such-and-such a time the shuttle was launched, at such-and-such a time a malfunction occurred in a particular system and such-and-such steps were taken. We have recently begun providing similar information, but nevertheless we should not forget that there are still state, military, and commercial secrets....

[Moroz] For a long time space flights were depicted by our propaganda as nonstop heroics designed to lift the people's spirits. It is not clear, however, which contribution was greater—raising the spirits or lowering morality. Everyone can see that space research is used by many people for career advances. Almost everyone who has been in space has very soon afterward moved swiftly up the professional ladder. Almost all the military people have become generals and colonels (even Tereshkova is an Air Force colonel!), and the "civilians" have been given posts the equivalent of general "in civilian life." But why, precisely? Is it because a person who has satisfied the requirements of space research also immediately meets the requirements of selection for the duties of a leader? Take that same Tereshkova, for example. She flew in space a quarter of a century ago. She felt poorly during the mission and was able to do almost nothing worthwhile. But her career since then has been dizzying, and she has been seated in presidiums continuously for more than 20 years. If one were to ask what she has accomplished that has been so outstanding in those leading posts, almost no one could answer (her own recent interview in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY clarified very little). Need we be surprised that people are dying to get into space research, including by taking advantage of protectionism, which is far removed from a craving for interesting work or romanticism. Moreover, have not former cosmonauts in some cases been employed in posts that would have been more suited to others?

[Dunayev] Here I disagree with you. In my opinion your accusations can be applied least of all to space research, in just the same way, I hope, as it applies to your colleague journalists who want to fly in space. Not least because you do not become healthy by protectionism. These are the statistics: Only one candidate is selected from about each 100 contenders. I can state that the overwhelming majority of cosmonauts are highly qualified specialists, people with a broad outlook, knowledge, and experience. If some of them, but by no means all of them, have "made a career" in the good sense of the word, then this is regular and justified. Good examples are Shatalov, Yeliseyev, Ryumin, Solovyev, Polyakov, Savinykh, and many others. I know our cosmonauts well, and the civilians, of course, better, and I can assure you that they are suitable people.

Some 15 cosmonauts are now working in the Glavkosmos system. Of these, five are test people, two are sector deputy chiefs, three are complex deputy chiefs. All of them have God only knows what kind of major duties. The others include a complex leader and a services leader and deputy leader, a deputy chief designer, and finally a deputy general designer. I can tell you directly that we make appointments according to brains and abilities. And this rapid advancement? If a person has worked for 20 or 30 years how can he not be a sector deputy chief? Talk with Solovyev, Ryumin, Aleksandrov, and Lebedev. Assess their levels. Or take those who have left us. Yeliseyev was elected vice chancellor of the Moscow Higher Technical School in the face of great opposition. Savinykh was elected vice chancellor of the Moscow Institute of Engineers of Geodesy, Aerial Photography, and Cartography. Aksenov was selected from three candidates for the post of director of the State Committee for Hydrometeorology, GOSNITSIPR [expansion unknown]. I was sorry to lose all of them, they are all fine workers.

It only seems that the life of a cosmonaut is paradise when they receive the awards and appear on television. In fact each mission is a definite risk, and very hard work. Also, life is not any easier after the mission. In addition, like all of us, they are busy with their own basic workk, but they still have their public work. This must also be maintained, and it is. True, some of them sometimes show symptoms of the star sickness....

[Moroz] Do you allow criticism?

[Dunayev] A strange question. Of course.

[Moroz] In 1986 I did a feature story on Feoktistov that was published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. In my opinion, he is one of the most interesting and nonconformist people in space research. In the story I cited his words on how difficult it is for space designers to live: "There is little to invent here except one thing; then you spend 90% or 95% of your energy convincing people that it must be done, so that the whole business is not ruined along the road. Moreover, the ladder above you to the leadership is so tall. Everyone wants to have his finger in the pie."

These words were deleted by your departmental censor, but I deliberately used them. What was the reaction? After publication the chiefs simply banned Feoktistov from appearing in print. There is your criticism!

[Dunayev] I do not recall that ban, but.... There are different chiefs. Some accept criticism normally, others do not. I would not make too broad a generalization out of this case.

In conclusion I would like to return to the basic subject of our conversation—to spending for space research. For us here in the motherland of space research a need has suddenly arisen to prove that space research is needed and that even today spending on it should be maintained at least at today's level. This issue has arisen nowhere else, not even in the developing countries. With respect to the developed countries, they spare no money and it is largely thanks to this that the high living standards of their populations are insured.

Today, space has entered so firmly into our lives that we no longer notice that we make use of its services every day. Satellite communications, navigational, meteorological, and ecological monitoring systems are all a result of space research. The hotheads who are demanding sharp spending cuts in space research evidently have no idea of what is entailed in reducing allocations for all this and for the many other national economy space systems, with all the consequences stemming from it. Is this wise? For all the people will immediately start to feel it.

Military

Official Outlines Military Exchange Programs

LD0401142890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1322 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jan (TASS)—The visit to Iraq by Army General Vladimir Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister, which began today, marks the initiation of a Defense Ministry plan for international contacts in 1990. Major General Ivan Golovanov, deputy chief of the Foreign Relations Directorate of the USSR Defense Ministry, said in an interview with a TASS correspondent that the plan has been coordinated between the leaders of the USSR Armed Forces and a large group of states.

The tasks of the Foreign Relations Directorate of the USSR Defense Ministry also include providing for all measures carried out by the Soviet military leadership for the foreign military-diplomatic corps. According to Gen Golovanov, 85 Army, Air Force, and Navy personnel, as well as military attaches on defense matters, have been accredited at foreign embassies in the USSR by the beginning of 1990. Approximately the same number of military diplomats have been accredited at Soviet embassies abroad.

The plan of contacts provides for various joint ventures with the United States, Great Britain, France, the FRG, Canada, Turkey, and many other countries. "We propose to reestablish previously disrupted military contacts with Indonesia and also to begin a dialogue with the leadership of the Japanese defense forces," Gen Golovanov said.

He noted with satisfaction that a further stepping up of contacts between Soviet and U.S. military personnel is planned in 1990. These include an exchange of delegations of military historians and military bands, delegations of higher military educational establishments, the staging of rifle-shooting competitions between Army marksmen of the two countries, visits to the USSR and the United States of high-ranking military leaders, and exchange of visits by warships.